

# **PaDRAI**

## **PENNSYLVANIA DETENTION RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT**

Developed by the PaDRAI Workgroup of the  
Detention Ad Hoc Committee of the  
PA Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers  
with support from the  
Center for Children's Law and Policy and the  
Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative of the  
Annie E. Casey Foundation

# Table of Contents

<u>PaDRAI Recommended Policies &amp; Protocols</u> .....	2
<u>Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (PaDRAI)</u> .....	8
<u>Example of PaDRAI Instructions</u> .....	11
<u>PaDRAI Implementation Study</u> .....	16
<u>PaDRAI Validation Study</u> .....	44
<u>PaDRAI Workgroup Members</u> .....	66

## Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (PaDRAI) Recommended Policies and Protocols

### I. Purpose of the PaDRAI

The Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (PaDRAI) is a concise, structured decision making instrument used to assist in the critical decision of whether to securely detain a youth, release to an alternative to detention (ATD), or release to the custody of a parent or responsible adult during the period that the youth is awaiting his/her juvenile court hearing. The instrument is designed to assess the risk of a youth to: 1) commit additional offenses while awaiting his/her juvenile court hearing; and/or 2) fail to appear for his/her scheduled juvenile court hearing.

The PaDRAI is modeled after instruments developed through the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) of the Annie E. Casey Foundation. JDAI-type detention risk assessment instruments have been in use for 20 years and replicated in over 200 jurisdictions in 39 states and the District of Columbia.

### II. Underlying Principles of the PaDRAI

The principles that underlie the use of the PaDRAI are to minimize bias and promote fair, unbiased, and transparent detention decisions. The use of detention for a youth is a critical decision in the juvenile justice system process. The PaDRAI aids in the decision to target the use of secure detention for youth who pose a significant risk to community safety or are at risk to not appear for their subsequent juvenile court hearings. When utilized properly, the PaDRAI can minimize the costly, unnecessary use of secure detention for youth who do not pose a risk to reoffend or abscond while awaiting their juvenile court proceedings.

JDAI has identified key principles that are central to the use of detention risk assessment instruments. These include:

- **Objectivity:** *Detention decisions should be based upon neutral and objective factors rather than on the screener's subjective opinion about an individual youth. Objective criteria anchor detention decisions in ascertainable facts such as the nature and severity of the offense, the number of prior referrals, or the minor's history of flight from custody.*
- **Uniformity:** *Local criteria should be uniform in the sense that they are applied equally to all minors referred for a detention decision. To achieve the desired level of uniformity, the criteria must be in a written (or electronic) format and must be incorporated into a screening process that is standardized for all referrals.*

- **Risk-based:** *The criteria should be risk-based, meaning that they should measure specific detention-related risks posed by the minor. These risks are: the risk of reoffending before adjudication and the risk of failing to appear at a court hearing.*<sup>1</sup>

### III. Components of the PaDRAI

It is important to understand that the components of the PaDRAI are not to be considered independently or separately, but all components function as an integrated unit to assess the risk of a youth to reoffend or abscond while awaiting their juvenile court proceedings. The PaDRAI is organized into the following components:

- Risk Factors** - Consists of the assignment of points for: 1) the most serious alleged offense; 2) additional related charges or pending charges; 3) prior findings; 4) current supervision status; 5) history of failure to appear; and 6) history of escape or runaway.
- Scoring of Risk Factors** - Consists of the tabulation of the points from Part One and a determination of whether the youth falls within the point range or guidelines and whether the following options should be considered: a) release to parent or responsible adult; b) use of a detention alternative; or c) admission to secure detention.
- Mandatory Detentions** - Consists of categories of offenses or specific circumstances which require the use of secure detention as matter of local policy.
- Discretionary Overrides** - Consists of mitigating or aggravating factors that support a decision that falls outside of established point ranges or guidelines.
- Detention Alternative Selected:** If the decision involved suggests the use of a detention alternative, identification of the type of detention alternatives that was selected.
- Actual Decision:** Identifies the option that was selected: a) release to parent or responsible adult; b) use of a detention alternative; or c) admission to secure detention.

### IV. Local Policy Decisions

#### a) **Who will be assessed, and at what point?**

Prior to implementation of the PaDRAI, jurisdictions need to establish to which youth, or at what point in the process, the PaDRAI will be administered. Below are several options that jurisdictions can consider:

- One option is that **all** youth charged with a delinquent offense and referred to the juvenile probation department will be assessed using the PaDRAI. This includes youth

---

<sup>1</sup> Steinhart, David, Esq., *Juvenile Detention Risk Assessment: A Practice Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform*, (2006), pg. 7. Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.

charged with low level offenses and non-existent or minimal risk to abscond histories that typically would not be considered for detention, as well as youth charged with more serious offenses and more extensive histories.

- ii. A second option is that the PaDRAI is administered only to youth for whom a request for secure detention is received from law enforcement or a juvenile probation officer who is considering secure detention for the youth. **Every** request for secure detention from law enforcement or internal juvenile probation request requires the administration of the PaDRAI.
- iii. A third option is that **all** youth who will be, or are, formally petitioned to Juvenile Court for an adjudication of delinquency will be administered the PaDRAI.
- iv. Counties may also want to consider assessing all youth who are considered for an Alternative to Detention (ATD).

**b) Recommendation to not use the PaDRAI for Technical Violation of Probation**

It is recommended that the PaDRAI **not** be used for technical violation(s) of probation. Jurisdictions are strongly encouraged to develop and adopt a comprehensive policy and protocol for the use Graduated Responses for technical violations of probation. Under a comprehensive Graduated Responses program, secure detention may be one of the options, albeit the most restrictive option, to appropriately and proportionally respond to technical violations of probation.

**c) Discretionary Overrides**

No tool can account for every unique scenario that a juvenile probation department may encounter. Mitigating and Aggravating factors can be considered when determining if an override is necessary. Clear instructions should be outlined in a department's policy as to when a discretionary override is used and in what situations it is appropriate to modify the tool's detention decision.

**Discretionary-Mitigating Overrides** involve decisions in which the score of the PaDRAI recommends secure detention; however, the decision is overridden to use either an Alternative to Detention (ATD) or Release to a Parent or Responsible Adult. Factors that may result in a Mitigating Override may include the age of the youth, mental health problems, or other aspects that, in the professional judgement of the juvenile probation officer, indicates that the youth may be a reasonable risk to use a less restrictive form of pre-hearing supervision.

Cases in which a Discretionary-Mitigating Override is used to should be closely monitored and tracked to determine the rate of failure to appear for hearings and/or re-offending while awaiting their Juvenile Court hearing.

**Discretionary-Aggravating Overrides** involve decisions in which the score of the PaDRAI recommends use of an ATD or Release to a Parent or Responsible Adult; however, the decision is

overridden to use secure detention. There should be clear and compelling reasons that that youth presents a significant risk to public safety and is a substantial risk to fail to appear for his/her Juvenile Court Hearing.

**All** discretionary overrides should be subjected to rigorous administrative review to determine whether the discretionary over was necessary as a result of clearly identifiable risk to re-offend or fail to appear for hearings or was a result of insufficient alternatives to manage the youth while awaiting his or her juvenile court hearing. Analysis with any recommendations should be provided to the Juvenile Court Judge and all relevant stakeholder.

---

### ***Fundamental Principles for Discretionary Overrides***

Because the inappropriate use of discretionary overrides can seriously undermine the legitimacy of the PaDRAI, discretionary overrides to detain **MUST** be monitored closely, and overrides to detain rates must be kept low. The Annie E. Casey Foundation’s best practices suggest that override to detain rates should be kept at or below 20%.

Discretionary overrides must be approved by a designated person (optimally, this would be a supervisor or senior manager). This “gate keeper” is essential to ensure that overrides are legitimate and documented clearly.

Again, discretionary overrides must be monitored to ensure that rates are kept low. Furthermore, overrides must be monitored for patterns, and efforts should be taken to address identified problems. For example, if a significant number of overrides occur due to an inability to locate parents or parents are slow to respond to take custody of a juvenile who qualifies for release, strategies should be implemented to increase parental engagement.

Discretionary overrides should only be used when specific, verifiable factors to modify the detention decision are present. Vague override reasons must be avoided. For example, a juvenile who presents a significant risk to community safety is a valid reason to consider an override, however, it’s vague. Documenting that the juvenile has a plan to, or has threatened to harm others if released is specific and provides a concrete rationale to support the override.

County-specific discretionary overrides may be added to the PaDRAI; however, such additions should only be done thoughtfully. County-specific overrides should be mapped directly to one of the standardized options in the PaDRAI that most closely approximates the county-specific override.

#### ***Discretionary Overrides Must Be:***

***Documented***

***Specific***

***Approved***

***Monitored***

---

d) **Mandatory Detentions**

**Mandatory Detentions** are specific circumstances in which a youth is detained regardless of the scoring of the Detention Assessment Risk Factors on the PaDRAI. Mandatory Detentions are determined by **local judicial policy**. It is recognized that Mandatory Detentions are sometimes required; however, it is **recommended that use of Mandatory Detentions be limited. Jurisdictions are encouraged to carefully consider the circumstances that warrant adopting Mandatory Detentions and whether the scoring the PaDRAI would achieve a similar outcome.** Any local judicial directive for a Mandatory Detention should be ***specific and in writing***. The local Mandatory Detentions should be reviewed no less than every 3 months to determine if the Mandatory Detentions should remain in effect.

V. **Initial Training and Booster Training**

Training on the purpose, principles, and use of the PaDRAI should be conducted as part of new juvenile probation orientation and ongoing training. Training should include proper scoring of the instrument, use of mandatory and discretionary overrides and use of secure detention and alternatives. Booster training should occur at least annually or any time a change in local policy in the use of secure detention and/or alternatives occurs. The proper application of the PaDRAI and resulting decisions should be a regular topic of supervisory conferences with staff.

VI. **Quality Assurance**

Quality Assurance (QA) processes should be instituted. Several processes that should be considered by jurisdictions:

- During the initial stages of implementation, a Juvenile Probation administrator or designated PaDRAI coordinator should review all PaDRAIs for accuracy and completeness. Over time, an audit of completed PaDRAIs should be conducted involving a percentage of no less than 10% of all completed PaDRAIs every six months.
- Small groups of juvenile probation officers score and discuss an actual or example case using the PaDRAI on a monthly basis to ensure consistency in application or inter-rater reliability of the PaDRAI.
- Routine review of management reports that summarizes/analyzes: PaDRAI risk scores; discretionary overrides and mandatory detentions; release, ATD and detention decisions; and re-offense and failure-to-appear data.
- ***Because of the potential overuse of discretionary aggravated overrides, rigorous administrative review and analysis of the use of discretionary aggravated overrides should be conducted monthly, at a minimum.***
- Regularly scheduled PaDRAI booster training utilizing QA data.

- Ongoing collection and analysis of data regarding: use of the PaDRAI; release, ATD and detention decisions; parental/responsible adult and ATD success rates; and re-offending and failure-to-appear information.

Policy should be established for corrective actions to be taken (i.e. increased supervision, booster training) if issues regarding the use of the PaDRAI are identified.

#### **VII. Referral Processes for Alternatives to Detention (ATD) and Secure Detention**

Each jurisdiction should establish in writing the referral/approval process for secure detention and ATDs. Reasons that would result in a youth being removed from an ATD should be clearly articulated. Any youth who is removed from an ATD should be reviewed by a supervisor. Failure to satisfactorily complete an ATD should be part of the QA process to ensure that referral processes and/or services provided by the ATD are appropriate and adequate.

#### **VIII. PaDRAI Scoring Instructions**

See attached *Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (PaDRAI) Instructions-Example*

## Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment Instrument

Youth's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ DOB: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_ JID #: \_\_\_\_\_ Admitting County: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gender: \_\_\_\_\_ Race: \_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic: Yes \_\_\_\_\_/No \_\_\_\_\_  
 Decision Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_ Time: \_\_\_:\_\_\_ AM/PM PaDRAI Completion Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_  
 Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_

1. **Most Serious New Alleged Offense - Specify:** \_\_\_\_\_
  - Felony I..... 15
  - Felony II or Felony Drug -Ungraded..... 12
  - Felony III ..... 7
  - Misdemeanor I..... 5
  - Misdemeanor II or Misdemeanor Drug - Ungraded..... 3
  - Misdemeanor III or Ungraded..... 1
  - NO New Charge..... 0
  
2. **Most Serious Additional Non-related Allegations (this detention request) or Pending Allegations (include Allegations Pending Court Action or Allegations Pending at Intake) - Specify:** \_\_\_\_\_
  - Felony I..... 10
  - Felony II or Felony Drug Ungraded..... 7
  - Felony III ..... 5
  - Misdemeanor I..... 4
  - Misdemeanor II or Misdemeanor Drug Ungraded..... 3
  - Misdemeanor III or Ungraded..... 1
  - NO Additional Non-related Charges..... 0
  
3. **Current Status**
  - Placement..... 7
  - Aftercare Supervision (within 2 months of release from out-of home placement)..... 5
  - Formal Probation ..... 4
  - Pre-Adjudication Alternative to Detention Program..... 3
  - Consent Decree..... 2
  - Informal Adjustment..... 1
  - NONE of the above..... 0
  
4. **Prior Adjudications or Consent Decrees (within the past 18 months/Includes both open & closed cases)**
  - Multiple prior findings for Felony Offenses (all gradings)..... 6
  - One prior findings for a Felony Offense (all gradings)..... 4
  - Multiple findings for Misdemeanor Offenses (all gradings)..... 3
  - One prior findings for a Misdemeanor Offense (all gradings)..... 1
  - One or More prior Consent Decrees..... 1
  - NO prior findings..... 0
  
5. **History of Warrants for Failure to Appear for Court Hearing(s) (active within past 12 months)**
  - Two or more warrants for failure to appear in past 12 months..... 3
  - One warrant for failure to appear in past 12 months..... 1
  - NO warrants for failure to appear in past 12 months..... 0
  
6. **History of Escape/AWOL/Runaway (within past 12 months)**
  - One or more escapes from secure confinement or custody..... 4
  - One or more instances of AWOL from non-secure, court-ordered, out-of-home placement..... 3
  - Two or more Runaways from home or voluntary out-of-home placement..... 1
  - NO History of escapes/ AWOLs in past 12 months..... 0

=

=

=

=

=

=

DETAIN = 15+

ATD = 10 - 14

RELEASE = 0 - 9

**DECISION BASED ON SCORE =**  **TOTAL SCORE =**

## Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment Instrument

### Mandatory Detention (MUST be detained) –

**Note:** Counties may add county-specific Mandatory Detentions. Mandatory Detentions should be only by written directive of Juvenile Court Judge or Chief Juvenile Probation Officer. The development, approval, monitoring and review of Mandatory Detentions should occur consistent with the recommended Policies and Protocols.

### Discretionary Override: MITIGATING FACTORS

(Please check the primary factor below that affected your decision. **All Discretionary Overrides must be accompanied by a comprehensive written explanation that provides specific reasons and rationale why the override was needed.**)

- Parent willing/able to provide supervision
- Juvenile has no prior record
- Juvenile marginally involved in the offense
- Facts alleged are less serious than the offense charged
- Juvenile is 13 years of age or younger
- New charge referred is not recent
- Juvenile is adjudicated dependent and C&Y agency has placement custody
- Juvenile has significant MH/MR problems or is in MH/MR placement
- Juvenile doing well on supervision absent this arrest
- Other (please specify, **required**):  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Note:** Counties may add additional Discretionary (Aggravating or Mitigating) Overrides with county-specific language. County-specific discretionary overrides should be only by written directive of Juvenile Court Judge or CJPO. If using county-specific override, the CJPO must identify how the override maps to a specific option on the standardized list.

**OR**

### Discretionary Override: AGGRAVATING FACTORS

(Please check the primary factor below that affected your decision. **All Discretionary Overrides must be accompanied by a comprehensive written explanation that provides specific reasons and rationale why the override was needed.**)

- Parent refusal
- Parent unavailable
- Juvenile has history of significant substance abuse problem
- Juvenile has a history of violence in the home or against family members
- Victim of current offense resides in the home.
- Juvenile poses a significant threat of failure to appear
- Unsuccessful ATD history (within the past 12 months)
- Juvenile refuses to participate/cooperate with ATD
- Victim / witness intimidation
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Note:** Counties may add additional Discretionary (Aggravating or Mitigating) Overrides with county-specific language. County-specific discretionary overrides should be only by written directive of Juvenile Court Judge or CJPO. If using county-specific override, the CJPO must identify how the override maps to a specific option on the standardized list.



## Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (PaDRAI) Instructions-Example

The purpose of the PaDRAI is to increase consistency in detention decisions, to minimize unnecessary or inappropriate admissions to secure detention, and to help examine other alternatives to secure detention when appropriate.

**The detention assessment must be completed on (insert policy decision on who, and at what point, the PaDRAI will be administered).** The Instrument must be completed and must be filled out as you are making your decision. Do not make your detention decision and then complete the detention assessment to fit your decision.

### Identifying/Demographic Information

1. Enter Name, DOB, and JID# (if known), and Admitting County.
2. Enter Decision Date, Time, and Date PaDRAI Completed, and by whom the instrument was completed. The decision date is the date when a decision was made to release, place on an ATD or admit to detention.
3. Enter Gender, Race and Ethnicity. For the initial identifying information, the race and ethnicity categories include the following (this information can be found in JCMS for existing cases).
  - a. Ethnicity- Hispanic/Latino, Non Hispanic/Latino or Unknown
  - b. Race- White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Unknown.

For both ethnicity and race, the “unknown” option should be used only when other options to obtain the information have been attempted (i.e. contacting the arresting officer, previous records, asking the youth).

### Scoring Risk Factors

[Insert policy decision whether your county’s policy is to score or not score the PaDRAI if a Mandatory Override applies. If your county’s policy is to score all cases including those where a Mandatory Override applies, you should complete the Risk Factors section and then determine whether a Mandatory Override applies. If the policy is not to score if a Mandatory Override applies, you should first scan the Mandatory Override and determine if a Mandatory Override applies to this case/matter, then do not score the Risk Factors.]

Check the box whether the PaDRAI is being completed for New Allegation, New Allegation & Discretionary Warrant, Discretionary Warrant Only, **OR** Violation of Probation Only

**For each section (#1-6), only one item can be selected/score assigned.** Pick the highest numbered item of the options provided that best fits the scenario. If none of the choices apply, that section is given a zero score. If you are unsure as to the appropriate score, do not guess. **If you are unable to ascertain the correct score, assign a zero.**

If using a paper version, circle the appropriate factor. Do not just enter the score.

<p><b>Section 1. Most Serious New Allegation -specify: _____.</b></p>
---

This section applies to detention requests for **new allegations only**.

- Confirm the allegation, crimes code section, and grading of the offense with the requesting police officer and enter this information. Keep in mind that the grading of certain offenses depends on a dollar amount of damage or worth or other specifics of the incident (i.e. Criminal Mischief, Forgery, Terroristic Threats, Theft, etc.).
- If you are detaining someone on violations only, this section scores a zero. If detaining on a charge, specify the most serious charge.
- Select the appropriate grading of the **Most Serious New Allegation**.

<p><b>Section 2. Most Serious Additional Non-Related Allegation (this referral) or Pending Allegation (include Allegations Pending Court Action or Allegations Pending at Intake)-specify: _____.</b></p>
---

This section applies to **additional Allegations unrelated to the most serious Allegations from Section 1**.

For example, a juvenile is charged with 3 burglaries - 3 different days and 3 different locations. He would be assigned a 15 in Section 1 and a 10 in Section II. You should confirm the grading of each Allegation. This section also applies to Allegation that are pending Court proceeding/findings. Example: A juvenile is charged with Simple Assault. He is pending court on another Simple Assault and Possession of a Weapon on School Property (separate incidents). He is scored a 5 in Section I and a 5 in Section II.

**Additional charges arising out of the most serious Allegations do not gather any additional points.** For example: a youth is being charged with Simple Assault of another juvenile. When police approach him, he assaults the police officer and is subsequently charged with Aggravated Assault. He is scored only on the most serious of the two incidents. He is scored a 15 in Section 1 and a zero in Section 2.

If law enforcement has indicated that they intend to file additional **Allegations**, but these **Allegations** have not yet been officially received and logged/recorded by the Juvenile Probation Department, these charges should **not be considered** for scoring.

- Enter **only the Most Serious Additional Non-Related Allegations (this referral) or Pending Allegations (this may include Allegations Pending Court Action or Allegations Pending at Intake)**

### Section 3. Current Status:

This section applies to the juvenile's current status only.

- a. If a case is closed or pending an intake, the score is zero.
- b. If a case is still open but the Consent Decree or Informal Adjustment has expired, score a zero in this section.
- c. Out-of-home placement refers to residential placement where the youth is removed from his/her home by order of court.
- d. If the juvenile completed an intake, but is not being supervised, score a zero.
- e. This section can apply to a juvenile's status with another probation jurisdiction, as long as you are able to obtain and verify accurate information.
- f. Select the appropriate **Current Status** category

### Section 4. Prior Adjudications of Delinquency or Consent Decrees (Within the past 18 months)

This section applies to Prior Adjudications of Delinquency and Consent Decrees where the first disposition has occurred within the past 18 months and includes open and closed cases. The Adjudications or Consent Decrees which occurred **more than 18 months** from the date the PaDRAI is being completed **should not** be scored. The date of the Adjudication or the date when the Consent Decree was signed/issued should be used to establish the time frame. Select the choice representing the highest score. **Only one choice may be selected.** **Both** open and closed cases should be counted.

- a. Informal adjustments are not scored.
- b. [Insert county- specific language for expedited cases, i.e. Fast Track] or cases closed at intake are not included.
- c. Non-payments of Fines and Costs (Criminal Transcripts) are not counted.
- d. Select the appropriate **Prior Adjudications or Consent Decrees** category.

### Section 5. History of Warrants for Failure to Appear for Court Hearing(s) (active within the past 12 months):

This section applies only to situations when a warrant was issued for failure to appear at a Juvenile Court Hearing.

- a. If unable to verify that there was an active warrant within the past 12 months and juvenile failed to appear for a court hearing, score this section a zero.
- b. The warrant could have been issued prior to 12 months ago; however, was open or active within the past 12 months.
- c. For current active warrants, refer to the mandatory override section.
- d. Select the appropriate **History of Warrants for Failure to Appear for Court Hearings** category.

<b>Section 6. History of Escape/AWOL/Runaway (within the last 12 months):</b>
---

This section applies to escapes/AWOL/runaways from home or delinquency out-of-home placements.

- a. Delinquency out-of-home placements by other jurisdictions do apply, if you can ascertain accurate information.
- b. If escaped from custody while transported to or from a secure confinement or out-of-home placement, score this section.
- c. Runaway from home or voluntary out-of-home placement must involve a youth's absence from his/her home for a period of greater than 24 hours without the knowledge and consent of the youth's parents/guardian or the staff of the out-of-home placement, or a Warrant has been issued by the Court due the youth having runaway and directing that youth be detained and brought before the Court.
- d. If the youth is charged with the offense of Escape, do not score this section, but rather score Section 1.
- e. Select the appropriate **History of Escape/AWOL/Runaway** category.

### **Indicated Decision**

After completing each section, total the score and determine the indicated Decision. Then determine if any of the mandatory overrides apply.

### **Mandatory Detentions**

Counties may add county-specific Mandatory Detentions. Mandatory Detentions should be only by written directive of Juvenile Court Judge or Chief Juvenile Probation Officers.

---

## **Adoption of Mandatory Detentions**

Counties are encouraged to score the PaDRAI and Risk Factors #1 thru #6 for all detention decisions. It is recognized that not all circumstances may be covered by the Risk Factors; however, most circumstances typically can be addressed and provide an indication of risk as it relates to the purposes for which the PaDRAI was designed. The design of the PaDRAI is limited to providing structure and assistance in assessing the risk for a youth to: 1) re-offend while awaiting his/her court hearing; and/or 2) fail to appear for his/her court hearing. Counties are encouraged to attempt to minimize the need for adoption of Mandatory Detentions by conducting analyses locally to determine if most cases in which the Mandatory Detention would be invoked would score at a sufficient level based on the Risk Factors to achieve the decision that is warranted before adopting the Mandatory Detention. The development, approval, monitoring and review of Mandatory Detention should occur consistent with recommended Policies and Protocols.

---

Determine if any of the county-specific Mandatory Detentions apply.

If no Mandatory Detentions apply, review the Discretionary Overrides (aggravating or mitigating factors). [Counties may also add county-specific Discretionary Overrides following the process for adding/creating county-specific Mandatory Detentions.] If appropriate, select a Discretionary Override. Only the primary Discretionary Override should be selected. If selected a Discretionary Override, a clear and complete narrative description of the reasons the Discretionary Override was selected is required. Any additional pertinent information should be included. Supervisory approval is required for cases where a Discretionary Override is provided.

**Important:** All staff should review the PaDRAI Policies and Protocols regarding the use of Mandatory and Discretionary Overrides and understand the importance to use overrides only when necessary and the requirements that **all Discretionary Overrides be fully Documented, Specific, Approved, and Monitored.**

### **Discretionary Override**

Determine if any of the Discretionary (Aggravating or Mitigating Factors) Overrides apply.

[Counties may add Discretionary Overrides from the standardized Override list in PaJCMS or create an override with county-specific language. County-specific overrides should be only by written directive of a Juvenile Court Judge or Chief Juvenile Probation Officer. If using a county-specific override, the Chief Juvenile Probation Officer must identify how the override maps to a specific option on the standardized list.]

Review the Discretionary Overrides (Aggravating or Mitigating factors). If appropriate, select a Discretionary Override. Only the primary Discretionary Override should be selected. If a Discretionary Override is selected, a clear and complete narrative description of the reasons the Discretionary Override was selected is required. Supervisory approval is required for cases where a Discretionary Override is provided.

**Important:** All staff should review the PaDRAI Policies and Protocols regarding the use and Discretionary Overrides and understand the importance to use overrides only when necessary and the requirements that **all Discretionary Overrides be fully Documented, Specific, Approved, and Monitored.**

### **Actual Decision**

Select the **Actual Decision** that was chosen.

**Pennsylvania Juvenile Detention Risk Assessment Instrument  
(PaDRAI):  
Results of a Three Month Implementation Pilot**

**Report submitted to the Pennsylvania Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative  
PaDRAI Workgroup  
May 2, 2014**

***Report Prepared by:  
Carrie L. Maloney, Ph.D.  
Shippensburg University***

## Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (PaDRAI) Pilot

---

On November 1, 2013, nine Pennsylvania counties began a three month pilot implementation of a consensus based juvenile detention risk assessment instrument. The draft PA Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (PaDRAI) was developed through the work of a statewide subcommittee comprised of juvenile probation representatives involved in the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). A primary goal of the subcommittee is to draft a screening instrument that may ultimately serve as a statewide tool. To that end, upon reaching consensus on a draft of the PaDRAI, six of the nine participating sites began utilizing the tool to aid in actual detention decision-making in their respective counties for a minimum of three months, from November 1, 2013 – January 31, 2014. The remaining three sites did not use the draft PaDRAI to guide actual detention decisions, however they agreed to provide basic scoring information for youth referrals for detention, in order to obtain a sense of how the PaDRAI could potentially influence detention decision-making in their respective counties. The following is a draft report of the Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment (PaDRAI) implementation pilot results.

### 1. Study sample

The final sample utilized for the current report included a total of N=918 cases, which were distributed across the pilot counties according to the following table:

Table 1. Distribution of PaDRAI pilot sample cases by county

	County								
	Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	Chester	Berks	Franklin	Lebanon	Total
<b>Total Cases</b>	194	282	75	138	56	73	31	69	918

In total, 918 cases were included in the implementation study. Counties that utilized the PaDRAI to guide actual detention decisions during the pilot included: Philadelphia, Allegheny, Lehigh, Lancaster, Chester, and Lebanon. Due to the high referral volume in Philadelphia county, PaDRAI data were collected and submitted on a subsample of the total number of referrals received per week. Berks, Franklin, and Cumberland counties collected PaDRAI data on actual detention referrals, however they did not utilize the PaDRAI recommendation to guide the actual referral decision. At the time of this report, Cumberland data was not yet available to the researcher.

It should be noted in the tables that follow, there are instances where the overall totals, or totals for individual counties are inconsistent with those shown above. This is due to a small number of cases missing some of the table variables. Missing data varies by county, and by variables. As such, each table where there is a discrepancy with the totals includes a footnote specifying the missing data. Ultimately, it was determined that the missing data was sufficiently low in number overall, and for each variable, that it was not necessary to exclude the entire case from the report.

## 2. Demographics of youth referrals to detention

Table 2 below presents a breakdown of referrals for which youth were screened for detention. The indicated race is identified for each call, and is further disaggregated by gender. Results are presented for each County. Totals indicate that 82.2% of the overall sample was male, with the remaining 17.8% of cases female. Of the males included in the sample, 51.9% were Black, while 45.7% were White. Similar results are shown for females, with 55.6% Black, and 42.6% White. Overall, Blacks represented 52.5% of the sample, while Whites represented 45.2%. This varied by County however. For example, Allegheny County had the highest proportion of Black youth, at 80.4%, while Franklin had the lowest proportion of Black youth (13.8%) and the Chester County sample had the lowest number of females (N=6).

Table 2. Youth Race & Gender by County (N=908\*)

Admitting County	Gender	Race				Total
		Black	White	Asian	Other	
Philadelphia	male	N	106	45		151
		%	70.2%	29.8%		100.0%
	female	N	31	7		38
		%	81.6%	18.4%		100.0%
	Total	N	137	52		189
		%	72.5%	27.5%		100.0%
Allegheny	male	N	182	41	7	230
		%	79.1%	17.8%	3.0%	100.0%
	female	N	43	6	1	50
		%	86.0%	12.0%	2.0%	100.0%
	Total	N	225	47	8	280
		%	80.4%	16.8%	2.9%	100.0%
Lehigh	male	N	23	37	2	62
		%	37.1%	59.7%	3.2%	100.0%
	female	N	3	9	0	12
		%	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Total	N	26	46	2	74
		%	35.1%	62.2%	2.8%	100.0%
Lancaster	male	N	38	73	2	115
		%	33.0%	63.5%	1.7%	100.0%
	female	N	4	17	0	23
		%	17.4%	73.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	Total	N	42	90	2	138
		%	30.4%	65.2%	1.4%	100.0%

<b>Chester</b>	male	N	13	33	1	3	50
		%	26.0%	66.0%	2.0%	6.0%	100.0%
	female	N	3	3	0	0	6
		%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Total	N	16	36	1	3	56
		%	28.6%	64.3%	1.8%	5.4%	100.0%
<b>Berks</b>	male	N	14	47			61
		%	23.0%	77.0%			100.0%
	female	N	3	9			12
		%	25.0%	75.0%			100.0%
	Total	N	17	56			73
		%	23.3%	76.7%			100.0%
<b>Franklin</b>	male	N	2	18		1	21
		%	9.5%	85.7%		4.80%	100.0%
	female	N	2	6		0	8
		%	25.0%	75.0%		0.00%	100.0%
	Total	N	4	24		1	29
		%	13.8%	82.8%		3.40%	100.0%
<b>Lebanon</b>	male	N	9	47			56
		%	16.1%	83.9%			100.0%
	female	N	1	12			13
		%	7.7%	92.3%			100.0%
	Total	N	10	59			69
		%	14.5%	85.5%			100.0%
<b>Total</b>	male	N	387	341	3	15	746
		%	51.9%	45.7%	0.4%	2.00%	100.0%
	female	N	90	69	0	3	162
		%	55.6%	42.6%	0.0%	1.80%	100.0%
	Total	N	477	410	3	18	908
		%	52.5%	45.2%	0.3%	1.90%	100.0%

\*For this table, the race was missing for a total of 10 cases: 5 Philadelphia, 2 Allegheny, 1 Lehigh, 2 Franklin.

Table 3 below displays the indicated ethnicity for each youth in the sample, again disaggregated by gender and presented for each county. Overall, Hispanic youth represented about 20% of the sample. This also varied by county, with no Hispanic youth included for Allegheny county, but 53% of the Berks, and 44% of the Lehigh samples were comprised of Hispanic youth. For the overall sample, there were slightly more Hispanic males (20.8%) than Hispanic females (17.8%). This pattern exists for each individual county, though specific proportions vary.

Table 3. Youth Ethnicity/Gender by county (N=903\*)

Admitting County	Gender		Hispanic/Latino		Total
			No	Yes	
Philadelphia	male	N	122	29	151
		%	80.80%	19.20%	100.00%
	female	N	33	6	39
		%	84.60%	15.40%	100.00%
	Total	N	155	35	190
		%	81.60%	18.40%	100.00%
Allegheny	male	N	224		224
		%	100.00%		100.00%
	female	N	50		50
		%	100.00%		100.00%
	Total	N	274		274
		%	100.00%		100.00%
Lehigh	male	N	34	29	63
		%	54.00%	46.00%	100.00%
	female	N	8	4	12
		%	66.70%	33.30%	100.00%
	Total	N	42	33	75
		%	56.00%	44.00%	100.00%
Lancaster	male	N	79	36	115
		%	68.70%	31.30%	100.00%
	female	N	17	6	23
		%	73.90%	26.10%	100.00%
	Total	N	96	42	138
		%	69.60%	30.40%	100.00%
Chester	male	N	46	4	50
		%	92.00%	8.00%	100.00%
	female	N	6	0	6
		%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	Total	N	52	4	56
		%	92.90%	7.10%	100.00%

<b>Berks</b>	male	N	29	32	61
		%	47.50%	52.50%	100.00%
	female	N	5	7	12
		%	41.70%	58.30%	100.00%
	Total	N	34	39	73
		%	46.60%	53.40%	100.00%
<b>Franklin</b>	male	N	14	6	20
		%	70.00%	30.00%	100.00%
	female	N	6	2	8
		%	75.00%	25.00%	100.00%
	Total	N	20	8	28
		%	71.40%	28.60%	100.00%
<b>Lebanon</b>	male	N	38	18	56
		%	67.90%	32.10%	100.00%
	female	N	9	4	13
		%	69.20%	30.80%	100.00%
	Total	N	47	22	69
		%	68.10%	31.90%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	male	N	586	154	740
		%	79.20%	20.80%	100.00%
	female	N	134	29	163
		%	82.20%	17.80%	100.00%
	Total	N	720	183	903
		%	79.70%	20.30%	100.00%

\*Ethnicity was missing for a total of N=15 cases: 4 Philadelphia, 8 Allegheny, 3 Franklin

Table 4. Average age of youth by gender, county (N=909\*)

Gender		County								Total
		Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	Chester	Berks	Franklin	Lebanon	
Male	age	16.0	16.8	16.2	16.2	17.1	16.5	15.7	16.5	16.4
	N	151	230	63	115	49	61	21	56	746
Female	age	14.9	15.5	16.5	16.3	18.0	15.8	16.2	16.1	15.7
	N	39	50	12	23	5	12	9	13	163
Total	age	15.8	16.6	16.2	16.3	17.1	16.4	15.9	16.4	16.3
	N	190	280	75	138	54	73	30	69	909

\*DOB was missing for a total of 1 case; PaDRAI completion date was missing for 8 cases

Table 4 above indicates the average ages for youth in the current sample. As shown, males were slightly older on average (16.4 yrs.) than females (15.7 yrs.). When examined by County, we can see there is not much variation in the average age for males. The youngest group of males were from Philadelphia (16.0 yrs.), the oldest from Chester (17.1). Quite a bit more variation across counties can be seen with respect to the average age of females. Philadelphia females averaged just 14.9 yrs., while Chester females averaged 18 yrs.

### 3. Nature of referrals

The next set of tables illustrates the nature of the referrals scored on the PaDRAI. Table 5 begins by providing the primary reason cited for the referral for each county. Over two-thirds (62.7%) of all referral were for youth having obtained new delinquency allegations. Just under one-fifth (19.4%) of referrals were for youth with violations, and a small percentage (6.7%) were referred for both new allegations and a violation. For about 5% of the cases, the PaDRAI was completed because a youth had an open warrant, detainer or judicial order only (i.e., no new allegations or violations), and for a minimal number of cases, referrals were made for youth who were failing to adjust in placement or had violated the conditions of a consent decree. As is illustrated, referral reasons did vary across counties. For example, in Philadelphia, nearly all referrals were for new charges (97.4%), however as noted in the footnote, Philadelphia differs from other sites in that they do not generally utilize the PaDRAI for violations. Both Lancaster and Lebanon overwhelmingly received referrals for new delinquency allegations (80.3% and 89.9% respectively), however new allegations represented only 21.8% of Chester and 47.4% of Allegheny referrals. Chester referrals were more likely to come in due to violations (60.0%), whereas the remaining Allegheny referrals were divided between violations (28.5%), New allegations and violations (12.8%), and for warrants, detainers and/or Judicial orders (9.5%). Of the remaining counties, Lehigh, Berks and Franklin counties had just about half or more of their referrals for new allegations, and the remaining referrals for violations or a combination of the two.

Table 5. Primary reason cited for referral (N=905\*)

County		New Chg.	Viol.	Reason for referral				Viol. Cons. Dec.	Total
				NC & Viol.	Fail Adj.	Warrant/ Det./ JO			
Philadelphia**	N	189	1	3	0	1	0	194	
	%	97.4%	0.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	100.0%	
Allegheny	N	130	78	35	0	26	5	274	
	%	47.4%	28.5%	12.8%	0.0%	9.5%	1.8%	100.0%	
Lehigh	N	50	10	11	1	0	0	72	
	%	69.4%	13.9%	15.3%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Lancaster	N	110	19	2	2	4	0	137	
	%	80.3%	13.9%	1.5%	1.5%	2.9%	0.0%	100.0%	
Chester	N	12	33	3	0	7	0	55	
	%	21.8%	60.0%	5.5%	0.0%	12.7%	0.0%	100.0%	
Berks	N	36	22	2	1	8	4	73	
	%	49.3%	30.1%	2.7%	1.4%	11.0%	5.5%	100.0%	
Franklin	N	19	6	5	0	0	1	31	
	%	61.3%	19.4%	16.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	100.0%	
Lebanon	N	62	7	0	0	0	0	69	
	%	89.9%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Total	N	608	176	61	4	46	10	905	
	%	67.2%	19.4%	6.7%	0.4%	5.1%	1.1%	100.0%	

\*Reason for referral was missing for a total of 13 cases: 8 Allegheny, 3 Lehigh, 1 Lancaster, 1 Chester.

\*\*It should be noted that Philadelphia county as a matter of policy does not typically utilize the screening instrument for violations only.

Table 6 provides further breakdown of the primary referral reason, disaggregating by race and gender. In terms of race, there was only a slight difference in the overall proportions of Black and White youth referred for new delinquency allegations (65.1% and 70.4% respectively). The two groups were even closer in terms of their likelihood to be referred for a violation only (18.7% of Blacks, 19.0% of Whites). Blacks were slightly more likely than Whites to be referred for new allegations and a violation concurrently (9.4%) than were whites (4.0%). Overall, these patterns were extremely similar when viewing referral reason by gender. One difference that sticks out however, is that Black females were more likely than white females to be referred for a combination of new allegations and a violation (10.1% vs. 1.5%).

Table 6. Primary reason cited for referral by Race/Gender (N=895\*)

Gender	Race		New Chg.	Viol.	Reason for referral				Total
					NC & Viol.	Fail Adj.	Warrant/ Det./ JO	Viol. Consent Decree	
Male	Black	N	252	71	35	0	22	3	383
		%	65.8%	18.5%	9.1%	0.0%	5.7%	0.8%	100.0%
	White	N	238	64	15	4	12	4	337
		%	70.6%	19.0%	4.5%	1.2%	3.6%	1.2%	100.0%
	Hispanic	N	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
		%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Asian	N	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
		%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	other	N	6	5	1	0	1	0	13
		%	46.2%	38.5%	7.7%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Total		N	499	141	51	4	35	7	737
		%	67.7%	19.1%	6.9%	0.5%	4.7%	0.9%	100.0%

Female	Black	N	54	17	9	6	1	87	
		%	62.1%	19.5%	10.3%	6.9%	1.1%	100.0%	
	White	N	47	13	1	5	2	68	
		%	69.1%	19.1%	1.5%	7.4%	2.9%	100.0%	
	Hispanic	N	2	0	0	0	0	2	
		%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	other	N	0	1	0	0	0	1	
		%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Total	N	103	31	10	11	3	158	
		%	65.2%	19.6%	6.3%	7.0%	1.9%	100.0%	
Total	Black	N	306	88	44	0	28	4	470
		%	65.1%	18.7%	9.4%	0.0%	6.0%	0.9%	100.0%
	White	N	285	77	16	4	17	6	405
		%	70.4%	19.0%	4.0%	1.0%	4.2%	1.5%	100.0%
	Hispanic	N	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
		%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Asian	N	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
		%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	other	N	6	6	1	0	1	0	14
		%	42.9%	42.9%	7.1%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	Total	N	602	172	61	4	46	10	895
		%	67.3%	19.2%	6.8%	0.4%	5.1%	1.1%	100.0%

\*Here, the total N reflects the missing cases for race and reason for referral as cited in footnotes above.

Table 7 below isolates those referrals for new delinquency allegations, showing the most serious alleged offense by county. Overall the largest proportion of these referrals was for a felony 2 or felony drug ungraded offense (20.5%), followed by felony 1 (14.3%). Taken together, misdemeanor allegations comprise nearly one-third of referrals, most of which were misdemeanor 2 or misdemeanor drug ungraded allegations (14.0%). Philadelphia, Allegheny, Lehigh, Chester, and Berks each had as the most serious allegation either a felony 1, felony 2 or felony drug ungraded offense. Lancaster, Franklin and Lebanon on the other hand, had misdemeanor level allegations as the most serious alleged offense.

In table 8, we can see the final detention decision made for referrals by the primary referral reason. It should be noted at this point in the analysis, Berks and Franklin county cases have been removed as they did not utilize the PaDRAI for detention decision-making, and therefore their inclusion would be inappropriate for the purposes of examining decision-making outcomes.

Of the remaining six counties, those cases referred for new delinquency allegations were interestingly most likely to be released (48.5%), however this is perhaps not unusual given the proportion of cases referred for misdemeanor offenses. Youth with new charges who were not released, were for the most part detained (42.1%), with a small proportion placed on an ATD. Among the youth referred for a violation, the vast majority (83.8%) were detained. In fact, the vast majority of youth referred for all of the remaining categories: New allegation & violation, failure to adjust, active warrant/detainer/judicial order, or violation of a consent decree, were ultimately detained.

Table 7. Most serious new alleged offense by county (N=914\*)

Offense		County								Total
		Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	Chester	Berks	Franklin	Lebanon	
felony 1	N	42	48	3	17	8	10	1	2	131
	%	21.8%	17.1%	4.0%	12.3%	14.3%	14.1%	3.2%	2.9%	14.3%
felony 2 or Felony Drug Ungraded	N	76	38	27	22	1	11	5	7	187
	%	39.4%	13.5%	36.0%	15.9%	1.8%	15.5%	16.1%	10.1%	20.5%
felony 3	N	13	21	9	13	2	7	4	3	72
	%	6.7%	7.5%	12.0%	9.4%	3.6%	9.9%	12.9%	4.3%	7.9%
Misdemeanor 1	N	24	26	5	21	1	2	7	16	102
	%	12.4%	9.3%	6.7%	15.2%	1.8%	2.8%	22.6%	23.2%	11.2%
Misdemeanor 2 or Misdemeanor Drug Ungraded	N	33	19	14	27	4	6	1	24	128
	%	17.1%	6.8%	18.7%	19.6%	7.1%	8.5%	3.2%	34.8%	14.0%
Misdemeanor 3 or Ungraded	N	3	12	1	12	0	1	6	9	44
	%	1.6%	4.3%	1.3%	8.7%	0.0%	1.4%	19.4%	13.0%	4.8%
NO new charge	N	2	117	16	26	40	34	7	8	250
	%	1.0%	41.6%	21.3%	18.8%	71.4%	47.9%	22.6%	11.6%	27.4%
Total	N	193	281	75	138	56	71	31	69	914
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

\*Most serious new alleged offense was missing in 4 cases: 1 Philadelphia, 1 Allegheny, 2 Berks.

Table 8. Final Detention Decision by referral reason, by county (N=801\*)

County	Reason	Final Detention Decision			Total	
		Release	ATD	Detention		
Philadelphia	New Charge(s)	N	87	12	90	189
		%	46.0%	6.3%	47.6%	100.0%
	Violation	N	0	0	1	1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	New charge(s) AND violation(s)	N	0	0	3	3
		%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Active warrant/detainer/JO	N	0	0	1	1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	N	87	12	95	194	
	%	44.8%	6.2%	49.0%	100.0%	
Allegheny	New Charge(s)	N	39	7	84	130
		%	30.0%	5.4%	64.6%	100.0%
	Violation	N	1	0	77	78
		%	1.3%	0.0%	98.7%	100.0%
	New charge(s) AND violation(s)	N	2	2	31	35
		%	5.7%	5.7%	88.6%	100.0%
	Active warrant/detainer/JO	N	0	1	25	26
		%	0.0%	3.8%	96.2%	100.0%
Violation Consent Decree	N	1	0	4	5	
	%	20.0%	0.0%	80.0%	100.0%	
Total	N	43	10	221	274	
	%	15.7%	3.6%	80.7%	100.0%	
Lehigh	New Charge(s)	N	17	12	21	50
		%	34.0%	24.0%	42.0%	100.0%
	Violation	N	0	4	6	10
		%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	New charge(s) AND violation(s)	N	0	0	11	11
		%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Fail to adjust	N	0	0	1	1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	N	17	16	39	72	
	%	23.6%	22.2%	54.2%	100.0%	
Lancaster	New Charge(s)	N	65	20	25	110
		%	59.1%	18.2%	22.7%	100.0%
	Violation	N	1	12	6	19
		%	5.3%	63.2%	31.6%	100.0%
	New charge(s) AND violation(s)	N	0	1	1	2
		%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Fail to adjust	N	0	0	2	2
		%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Active warrant/detainer/JO	N	0	0	4	4	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Total	N	66	33	38	137	
	%	48.2%	24.1%	27.7%	100.0%	
Chester	New Charge(s)	N	1	0	11	12
		%	8.3%	0.0%	91.7%	100.0%
	Violation	N	0	3	30	33
		%	0.0%	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%
	New charge(s) AND violation(s)	N	0	0	3	3
		%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Active warrant/detainer/JO	N	0	0	7	7
		%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	N	1	3	51	55	
	%	1.8%	5.5%	92.7%	100.0%	

Lebanon	New Charge(s)	N	59	1	2	62
		%	95.2%	1.6%	3.2%	100.0%
	Violation	N	3	0	4	7
		%	42.9%	0.0%	57.1%	100.0%
	Total	N	62	1	6	69
		%	89.9%	1.4%	8.7%	100.0%
Total	New Charge(s)	N	268	52	233	553
		%	48.5%	9.4%	42.1%	100.0%
	Violation	N	5	19	124	148
		%	3.4%	12.8%	83.8%	100.0%
	New charge(s) AND violation(s)	N	2	3	49	54
		%	3.7%	5.6%	90.7%	100.0%
	Fail to adjust	N	0	0	3	3
		%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Active warrant/detainer/JO	N	0	1	37	38
		%	0.0%	2.6%	97.4%	100.0%
	Viol. Consent Decree	N	1	0	4	5
		%	20.0%	0.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	Total	N	276	75	450	801
%		34.5%	9.4%	56.2%	100.0%	

\*As indicated in the referral reason table above, this data is missing for a total of 13 cases: 8 Philadelphia, 3 Lehigh, 1 Lancaster, 1 Chester. Total sample N now = 814 as Berks and Franklin counties have been removed from the sample for the remainder of the analysis.

#### 4. Extent and Nature of PaDRAI Overrides

Tables 9 through 19 provide detailed analysis of PaDRAI overrides. First the overall extent of any type of override is examined (Table 9), followed by a look at more detailed reasons for the overrides (Tables 10-13). After seeing some of the override reasons, we then look at some comparisons between the PaDRAI recommendations and the actual placements (Tables 14-19).

Starting with Table 9, we see that the overall override rate across the participating counties is 40.3%. Of youth detained in the sample, 49.5% were detained as a result of an override. This is compared to 27.8% of released youth being a result of an override, and 30.8% of ATD youth. Override rates did vary by county, with the highest proportion seen in Chester county (55.4%), followed by Allegheny (49.3%). The lowest override rates were evident in Lebanon (17.4%) and Philadelphia (32.0%). With the exception of Philadelphia and Lebanon, just about half or more of the detained youth in each of the counties were detained as a result of an override.

Given the extent of overrides, the next set of tables provides details on the nature of these overrides. In addition, beginning with table 10, the override sample was limited to those cases where the youth would NOT have scored for detention. Table 9 included all cases, including those for youth who would have scored for detention. This is for two primary reasons. First, decision-makers are typically able to use discretion to override down, youth who score for detention. However, when sites have local mandatory overrides, this discretion tends to no longer be allowed. Therefore, it is valuable to have override information on all cases, irrespective of the PaDRAI score in this implementation analysis. Second, in its current form, the PaDRAI does in fact conceive of warrant/detainer/judicial orders as overrides, and as such the report should indicate these initial findings. The committee did however express interest in

further narrowing down the nature of their override use, particularly for cases where the PaDRAI did recommend something other than secure detention. These cases are the focus of the next several tables.

Table 9. Final Detention Decision by override cited, by county (N=814)

County	Decision		Any Override		Total
			No	Yes	
Philadelphia	Release	N	56	31	87
		%	64.4%	35.6%	100.0%
	ATD	N	12	0	12
		%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Detain	N	64	31	95
		%	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%
Total	N	132	62	194	
	%	68.0%	32.0%	100.0%	
Allegheny	Release	N	33	11	44
		%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	ATD	N	6	5	11
		%	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	Detain	N	104	123	227
		%	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
Total	N	143	139	282	
	%	50.7%	49.3%	100.0%	
Lehigh	Release	N	9	8	17
		%	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
	ATD	N	10	6	16
		%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	Detain	N	23	19	42
		%	54.8%	45.2%	100.0%
Total	N	42	33	75	
	%	56.0%	44.0%	100.0%	
Lancaster	Release	N	48	18	66
		%	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
	ATD	N	22	12	34
		%	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
	Detain	N	17	21	38
		%	44.7%	55.3%	100.0%
Total	N	87	51	138	
	%	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%	
Chester	Release	N	1	0	1
		%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	ATD	N	4	0	4
		%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Detain	N	20	31	51
		%	39.2%	60.8%	100.0%
Total	N	25	31	56	
	%	44.6%	55.4%	100.0%	
Lebanon	Release	N	53	9	62
		%	85.5%	14.5%	100.0%
	ATD	N	0	1	1
		%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Detain	N	4	2	6
		%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Total	N	57	12	69	
	%	82.6%	17.4%	100.0%	

Total	Release	N	200	77	277
		%	72.2%	27.8%	100.0%
	ATD	N	54	24	78
		%	69.2%	30.8%	100.0%
	Detain	N	232	227	459
		%	50.5%	49.5%	100.0%
	Total	N	486	328	814
		%	59.7%	40.3%	100.0%

Table 10. Primary override reason, by county (N=295\*)

Primary OR Reason		County						Total
		Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	Chester	Lebanon	
Mandatory-Bench Warrant	N	2	56	0	1	11	0	70
	%	3.30%	43.40%	0.00%	2.60%	35.50%	0.00%	23.70%
Mandatory-Judicial Order	N	1	8	0	4	11	1	25
	%	1.70%	6.20%	0.00%	10.50%	35.50%	14.30%	8.50%
OR Subtotal: State Mandatory	N	3	64	0	5	22	1	95
	%	5.0%	49.6%	0.0%	13.2%	71.0%	14.3%	32.2%
Mandatory-Local	N	3	21	5	5	0	0	34
	%	5.00%	16.30%	16.70%	13.20%	0.00%	0.00%	11.50%
Discretionary-Aggravating	N	24	36	18	18	9	1	106
	%	40.00%	27.90%	60.00%	47.40%	29.00%	14.30%	35.90%
Discretionary-Mitigating	N	30	6	7	10	0	5	58
	%	50.00%	4.70%	23.30%	26.30%	0.00%	71.40%	19.70%
OR Subtotal: Discretionary	N	54	42	25	28	9	6	164
	%	90.0%	32.6%	83.3%	73.7%	29.0%	85.8%	55.6%
OR info missing	N	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	%	0.00%	1.60%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.70%
Total	N	60	129	30	38	31	7	295
% of total cases		30.9%	45.7%	40.0%	27.5%	55.4%	10.1%	36.2%

\*Total N reflects only overrides indicated for cases scoring below the threshold for detention on the PaDRAI (15 points).

According to table 10, about one-third (32.2%) of all override cases were due to one of the statewide mandatory criteria: bench warrant, or judicial order. This was most prominent in Chester (71.0%) and Allegheny (49.6%) counties. Conversely, state mandatory overrides were not used at all in Lehigh county, and in only 5.0% of Philadelphia cases. Lancaster and Lebanon counties had state mandatory override rates below 15.0%. A second category of mandatory overrides include cases where local juvenile court jurisdictions have predetermined types of cases where youth must be automatically detained. Chester and Lebanon counties did not utilize local mandatory overrides for any of their sample cases. For both Allegheny and Lehigh counties, local mandatory overrides accounted for just over 16.0% of overrides. In total, these types of overrides accounted for 11.5% of all override cases.

The remaining overrides fall into one of the two discretionary categories: aggravating or mitigating. In total, these comprise 55.6% of all override cases. Aggravating overrides result in a more restrictive detention decision. These accounted for a total of 35.9% of overrides. Again, there is substantial variation by county, with discretionary aggravating overrides accounting for 60.0% of the Lehigh overrides, and 40.0% of Philadelphia overrides, but only 14.1% (N=1) of Lebanon cases. Discretionary mitigating overrides are those that result in a less restrictive detention decision than recommended by the PaDRAI. These accounted for just about one-fifth (19.7%) of all overrides, with the highest proportion experienced in Lebanon (71.4%) and Philadelphia (50.0%); and the lowest in Allegheny (4.7%).

Table 11 goes on to explore further, the nature of the local mandatory override reasons. Specifically, the table provides a breakdown by county, of the local mandatory overrides that were added to the actual PaDRAI document in some of the local jurisdictions.

Table 11. Nature of local mandatory overrides by county (N=34)

Local mandatory OR reason		County				Total
		Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	
CYF Attach & Active Probation	N	0	2	0	0	2
	%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Fail to Adjust	N	0	3	1	0	4
	%	0.0%	14.3%	20.0%	0.0%	11.8%
Abscond Ct. ordered placement	N	0	0	1	2	3
	%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	8.8%
Decertification	N	1	0	0	0	1
	%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%
Felony Drug Sales	N	1	2	0	0	3
	%	33.3%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%
Firearms Offense	N	1	14	1	2	18
	%	33.3%	66.7%	20.0%	40.0%	52.9%
Self Removal from EM	N	0	0	1	1	2
	%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	5.9%
Local Court Ordered by Judge	N	0	0	1	0	1
	%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	2.9%
Total	N	3	21	5	5	34
	%	8.8%	61.8%	14.7%	14.7%	100.0%

As table 11 above indicates, local mandatory overrides varied, however more than half (52.9%) were due to the current alleged offense being firearms related. This accounted for at least one case in each of the counties utilizing local mandatory overrides, and for 66.7% of the Allegheny local mandatory overrides. The next highest proportion of local mandatory overrides was for failure to adjust (11.8%), however this was cited in only a total of 4 cases.

Next, tables 12 and 13 examine the nature of the aggravating discretionary overrides. Table 12 provides a breakdown by county, of those factors added to the PaDRAI upfront as predetermined reasons a discretionary override may occur. Besides the 'other' category, which is further described in table 13, the largest proportion of discretionary aggravating overrides was related to a parent refusal to supervise the youth. This accounted for 19.8% of all discretionary aggravating overrides, and was highest in Allegheny county (30.6%), followed by Chester (22.2%) and Philadelphia (20.8%). The next two highest proportions of discretionary overrides were due to parent unavailability (6.6%), and because the victim of the alleged offense resides in the home of the juvenile (8.5%). Taken together, just over one-third (34.9%) of discretionary aggravating overrides were due to home/family issues, rather than for reasons attributed to the youth and his/her perceived risk. As an even higher proportion of discretionary overrides were cited as being for 'other' reasons, table 13 further categorizes these instances.

Table 12. Primary aggravating discretionary override reason by county (N=106)

Primary Aggravating Factor		County						Total
		Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	Chester	Lebanon	
parent refusal	N	5	11	2	1	2	0	21
	%	20.8%	30.6%	11.1%	5.6%	22.2%	0.0%	19.8%
parent unavailable	N	3	4	0	0	0	0	7
	%	12.5%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%
juvenile has history of significant substance abuse problem	N	0	3	2	1	0	0	6
	%	0.0%	8.3%	11.1%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%
juvenile has a history of violence in the home or against family members	N	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
	%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
victim of current offense resides in the home	N	0	5	0	4	0	0	9
	%	0.0%	13.9%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%
juvenile poses a significant threat of failure to appear	N	1	1	3	0	1	0	6
	%	4.2%	2.8%	16.7%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	5.7%
unsuccessful ATD history w/in past 12 months	N	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	1.9%
juvenile refuses to participate/cooperate with ATD	N	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
	%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	11.1%	100.0%	2.8%
victim/witness intimidation	N	2	0	0	2	0	0	4
	%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%
other	N	11	9	8	9	3	0	40
	%	45.8%	25.0%	44.4%	50.0%	33.3%	0.0%	37.7%
Missing	N	2	2	2	0	0	0	6
	%	8.3%	5.6%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%
Total	N	24	36	18	18	9	1	106
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

As can be seen in table 13, five of the six counties cited 'other' as the reason for an aggravating discretionary override. In these instances, decision-makers were required to provide narratives explaining the decision. These narratives were reviewed and the primary reasons collapsed into the categories shown in the table. Percentages were not provided as there were too few cases in each for a percentage to provide meaningful analysis. However, there are a few points worth

noting. First, the reason most cited was for narcotics having been confiscated at the time of arrest. This occurred in 5 instances, all in Philadelphia. In 4 cases, decision-makers cited that the youth was already on, or was being uncooperative with an ATD. This occurred in 3 of the counties. Otherwise, the 'other' reasons cited for discretionary aggravating overrides were quite varied and case specific. However it is worth noting that in some instances, the reasons cited are factors that the PaDRAI itself is designed to already take into account when assessing a youths' risk, such as 'prior history/pending charges', 'nature of alleged offense', 'history of running away', and 'history of probation and recent discharge'.

Table 13. Categorization of 'other' aggravating discretionary overrides, by county (N=40)

Reason	County					Total
	Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	Chester	
Nature of Alleged Offense	3	0	0	0	0	3
Lack of Supervision/Control at Home	0	0	0	1	0	1
Nature of Alleged Offense & Lack of Supervision in Home	0	0	1	0	0	1
Per ADA	0	0	0	3	0	3
Prior History/Pending Charges	0	1	0	1	0	2
Juvenile on or Uncooperative with ATD	1	0	0	2	1	4
Narcotics Confiscated at Arrest	5	0	0	0	0	5
Juvenile Made Threats to Another	0	1	0	0	0	1
Safety of Juvenile & Alleged Victim in Home	0	1	0	0	0	1
Juvenile Involved in Gang Violence	0	0	1	0	0	1
Recency of Priors	1	0	0	0	0	1
Serious Victim Injuries	1	2	1	0	0	4
PO Plans to File FTA	0	1	0	0	0	1
Amount of Drugs Confiscated	0	1	0	0	0	1
Juvenile is Runaway from Home	0	1	0	0	0	1
Aggressive with Police/PO Staff	0	1	1	0	0	1
Assaulted Placement Staff Multiple Times	0	0	1	0	0	1
History of Probation & Recent Discharge	0	0	1	0	0	1
History of Running Away & Truancy	0	0	1	0	0	1
Has Not Been Residing at Home	0	0	1	1	0	2
Multiple Victims of Alleged Sex Offense Over Several Years	0	0	0	1	0	1
Assisted Placement Juvenile with Escape	0	0	0	0	1	1
History of Violence in the Home	0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>40</b>

After examining the overall extent and nature of overrides across counties, the next set of tables specifically compare the PaDRAI recommendation with the actual detention decision. Table 14 provides a summary of all counties taken together, and table 15 by county.

As shown in table 14, those cases where the PaDRAI recommendation and the actual detention decision 'matched' are highlighted. The highest overall proportion of matches occurred for cases recommending detention (87.9%). This was followed by cases where the PaDRAI recommended release, with about two-thirds of these cases resulting in a release (66.9%). The proportion of match cases where the PaDRAI recommended an ATD however, was substantially lower, with only 21.6% of these youth having actually been placed on an ATD. These youth were significantly more likely to be detained (56.0%), however a number were also ultimately released to a parent or guardian (22.4%).

Table 14. Comparison of PaDRAI recommendation & final detention decision, all counties (N=813\*)

Actual Decision	Indicated PaDRAI Decision/Recommendation			Total	
		Release	ATD		Detain
Release	N	200	56	21	277
	%	66.90%	22.40%	8.00%	34.10%
ATD	N	13	54	11	78
	%	4.30%	21.60%	4.20%	9.60%
Detain	N	86	140	232	458
	%	28.80%	56.00%	87.90%	56.30%
Total	N	299	250	264	813
	%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

\*A total of 1 case was missing the PaDRAI recommendation as the score was not completed. This was from Philadelphia. Case was a decertification.

In table 15, we can see the breakdown of PaDRAI recommendation vs. actual detention decision by county. With the exception of Lebanon and Lancaster, the vast majority of cases for which the PaDRAI recommended detention, did in fact result in detention. In Lancaster, this match occurred for just over half of the detention recommended cases (56.7%), with 26.7% instead released, and 16.7% placed on an ATD. In Lebanon, an additional 44.4% were released, and one youth placed on an ATD (11.1%).

In terms of those cases where the PaDRAI recommended release, we see significant matches in Philadelphia (86.2%), Lebanon (98.1%) and Lancaster (73.8%). Chester county had the lowest percent matches in this category, with just 7.7%, while the remaining 92.3% of released recommendations instead detained. In Allegheny county, 29.8% of release cases matched, with the majority of remaining release recommendations resulting in detention (57.8%). For Lehigh county, matches occurred for 47.4% of cases, and the remaining release recommendations were more split between ATD (21.1%) and detention (31.6%).

Finally, with respect to cases for which the PaDRAI recommended an ATD, we see the lowest proportion of matches in each of the counties. However, we also see more variation with respect to the ultimate decision. For instance, in Philadelphia, only 19.0% of ATD recommendations matched. However while 33.3% of these cases ultimately resulted in detention, nearly half (47.6%) resulted in a release to a parent or guardian. Allegheny on the other hand, matched for ATD recommendations just 7.1% of the time, with the vast majority instead detained (88.2%). In Chester county, ATD matches occurred 17.4% of the time, and all of the remaining cases were detained (82.6%). The non-matches for ATD were more evenly split between release and detain in Lancaster (23.3% and 25.6% respectively), and in Lehigh a greater proportion of non-matches resulted in detention (43.3%) as opposed to release (23.3%). On the other hand in Lebanon, there were no ATD matches, but the vast majority of cases were instead released (83.3%).

Table 15. Comparison of PaDRAI recommendation & actual detention decision by county (N=813\*)

County			INDICATED PADRAI DECISION/RECOMMENDATION			Total
			Release	ATD	Detain	
Philadelphia	Release	N	56	30	1	87
		%	86.2%	47.6%	1.5%	45.1%
	ATD	N	0	12	0	12
		%	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%	6.2%
	Detain	N	9	21	64	94
		%	13.8%	33.3%	98.5%	48.7%
Total	N	65	63	65	193	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Allegheny	Release	N	33	4	7	44
		%	39.8%	4.7%	6.1%	15.6%
	ATD	N	2	6	3	11
		%	2.4%	7.1%	2.6%	3.9%
	Detain	N	48	75	104	227
		%	57.8%	88.2%	91.2%	80.5%
Total	N	83	85	114	282	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Lehigh	Release	N	9	7	1	17
		%	47.4%	23.3%	3.8%	22.7%
	ATD	N	4	10	2	16
		%	21.1%	33.3%	7.7%	21.3%
	Detain	N	6	13	23	42
		%	31.6%	43.3%	88.5%	56.0%
Total	N	19	30	26	75	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Lancaster	Release	N	48	10	8	66
		%	73.8%	23.3%	26.7%	47.8%
	ATD	N	7	22	5	34
		%	10.8%	51.2%	16.7%	24.6%
	Detain	N	10	11	17	38
		%	15.4%	25.6%	56.7%	27.5%
Total	N	65	43	30	138	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chester	Release	N	1	0	0	1
		%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
	ATD	N	0	4	0	4
		%	0.0%	17.4%	0.0%	7.1%
	Detain	N	12	19	20	51
		%	92.3%	82.6%	100.0%	91.1%
Total	N	13	23	20	56	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Lebanon	Release	N	53	5	4	62
		%	98.1%	83.3%	44.4%	89.9%
	ATD	N	0	0	1	1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	1.4%
	Detain	N	1	1	4	6
		%	1.9%	16.7%	44.4%	8.7%
Total	N	54	6	9	69	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Total	Release	N	200	56	21	277
		%	66.9%	22.4%	8.0%	34.1%
	ATD	N	13	54	11	78
		%	4.3%	21.6%	4.2%	9.6%
	Detain	N	86	140	232	458
		%	28.8%	56.0%	87.9%	56.3%
Total	N	299	250	264	813	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

\*Total N reflects the missing Philadelphia case described above.

Tables 16 and 17 focus specifically on those cases for which the PaDRAI recommended release, but were instead detained. Table 16 indicates the lead override reason for these cases by county, and table 17 disaggregates the discretionary aggravated overrides for these cases by race and gender.

Table 16 shows that while in total, 60.5% of these cases were overridden as a result of a bench warrant, judicial order, or local mandatory override reason, more than one-third (37.2%) were for discretionary reasons. For Philadelphia, Lehigh, Lancaster and Chester, these overrides accounted for the largest proportions of release-to-detention overrides (66.7%, 66.7%, 40.0%, and 41.7% respectively).

Table 16. Override type for PaDRAI recommended release, final detention decision detain, by county (N=86)

Lead Override Reason		County						Total
		Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	Chester	Lebanon	
Mandatory-Bench Warrant	N	1	23	0	1	2	0	27
	%	11.1%	47.9%	0.0%	10.0%	16.7%	0.0%	31.4%
Mandatory-Judicial Order	N	1	3	0	3	5	1	13
	%	11.1%	6.2%	0.0%	30.0%	41.7%	100.0%	15.1%
Mandatory-Local	N	1	7	2	2	0	0	12
	%	11.1%	14.6%	33.3%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.0%
Discretionary-Aggravating	N	6	13	4	4	5	0	32
	%	66.7%	27.1%	66.7%	40.0%	41.7%	0.0%	37.2%
Discretionary-Mitigating	N	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
OR info missing	N	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Total	N	9	48	6	10	12	1	86
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 17 below indicates that overwhelmingly, males were represented among the youth recommended for release, but were detained (90.6%).

Table 17. Race &amp; Gender for discretionary aggravating overrides to detention for PaDRAI release recommendations, by county (N=32)

Gender	Race		County					Total
			Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	Chester	
Male (90.6%)	Black	N	5	7	1	2	0	15
		%	83.3%	63.6%	25.0%	66.7%	0.0%	51.7%
	White	N	1	4	2	1	4	12
		%	16.7%	36.4%	50.0%	33.3%	80.0%	41.4%
	Hispanic	N	0	0	1	0	0	1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
	other	N	0	0	0	0	1	1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	3.4%
	Total	N	6	11	4	3	5	29
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Female (9.4%)	Black	N		2		0		2
		%		100.0%		0.0%		66.7%
	White	N		0		1		1
		%		0.0%		100.0%		33.3%
	Total	N		2		1		3
%			100.0%		100.0%		100.0%	
Total	Black	N	5	9	1	2	0	17
		%	83.3%	69.2%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	53.1%
	White	N	1	4	2	2	4	13
		%	16.7%	30.8%	50.0%	50.0%	80.0%	40.6%
	Hispanic	N	0	0	1	0	0	1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%
	other	N	0	0	0	0	1	1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	3.1%
	Total	N	6	13	4	4	5	32
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Among the male youth, just over half were Black (51.7%), while 41.4% were white. While this is not a very large gap, there is variation across counties. Black youth recommended for release in Philadelphia, Allegheny, and Lancaster were more likely to be detained than white youth. Conversely, in Lehigh and Chester, white youth recommended for release were more likely to be detained than Black youth. It should be noted however that overall, the total number of cases for each category of youth are very small, ranging from 0-7.

Tables 18 and 19 focus specifically on those cases for which the PaDRAI recommended an ATD, but were instead detained. Table 18 provides the lead override reasons for these cases by county, and table 19 provides the race-gender breakdown of the discretionary aggravating overrides by county.

According to table 18, Just over half (52.9%) of non-matches were a result of a bench warrant, judicial order, or mandatory local override. Nearly half of all cases recommended for an ATD that were detained were a result of discretionary aggravating circumstances (45.0%). With the exception of Allegheny and Chester counties, the vast majority (if not all) ATD non-match cases were a result of discretionary overrides. In Allegheny, these represented 29.3% of cases, with bench warrants and local mandatory overrides making up the bulk of the remaining non-matches. In Chester county, discretionary overrides accounted for 21.1% of non-matches, and the remaining cases were overridden due to a bench warrant or judicial order.

Table 18. Override type for PaDRAI recommended ATD, final placement decision detain, by county (N=140)

Lead Override Reason		County						Total
		Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	Chester	Lebanon	
Mandatory-Bench Warrant	N	1	31	0	0	9	0	41
	%	4.8%	41.3%	0.0%	0.0%	47.4%	0.0%	29.3%
Mandatory-Judicial Order	N	0	5	0	0	6	0	11
	%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	31.6%	0.0%	7.9%
Mandatory-Local	N	2	14	3	3	0	0	22
	%	9.5%	18.7%	23.1%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	15.7%
Discretionary-Aggravating	N	18	22	10	8	4	1	63
	%	85.7%	29.3%	76.9%	72.7%	21.1%	100.0%	45.0%
Discretionary-Mitigating	N	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
OR info missing	N	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Total	N	21	75	13	11	19	1	140
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 19 provides the race and gender breakdown for ATD non-match cases. While here we see a greater proportion of females represented (20.6%), the vast majority are males (79.4%). Overall, Black youth recommended for an ATD were significantly more likely to be detained than white youth (66.7% vs. 31.7% respectively). This pattern holds for both males and females. In Philadelphia, Allegheny, Chester and Lebanon, there is a fairly large gap with respect to males,

with Black youth much more likely to be detained than white youth. In Lehigh, Black and white youth were equally likely to be detained, while in Lancaster Black youth were slightly more likely to be detained than white youth.

Table 19. Race & Gender for discretionary aggravating overrides to detention for PaDRAI ATD recommendations, by county (N=63)

Gender	Race		County					Total	
			Philadelphia	Allegheny	Lehigh	Lancaster	Chester		Lebanon
Male (79.4%)	Black	N	10	11	4	4	3	1	33
		%	76.9%	64.7%	50.0%	57.1%	75.0%	100.0%	66.0%
	White	N	3	6	4	3	1	0	17
		%	23.1%	35.3%	50.0%	42.9%	25.0%	0.0%	34.0%
	Total	N	13	17	8	7	4	1	50
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Female (20.6%)	Black	N	4	5	0	0			9
		%	80.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%			69.2%
	White	N	1	0	2	0			3
		%	20.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%			23.1%
	Hispanic	N	0	0	0	1			1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%			7.7%
Total	N	5	5	2	1			13	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			100.0%	
Total	Black	N	14	16	4	4	3	1	42
		%	77.8%	72.7%	40.0%	50.0%	75.0%	100.0%	66.7%
	White	N	4	6	6	3	1	0	20
		%	22.2%	27.3%	60.0%	37.5%	25.0%	0.0%	31.7%
	Hispanic	N	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
Total	N	18	22	10	8	4	1	63	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

## 5. Decision-Making Consistency

Table 20 provides a basic view of decision-making consistency upon the implementation of the PaDRAI pilot. Here, we compare the PaDRAI placement with the results of the first hearing in order to see the extent to which decisions are consistent across the two time-periods, or if officials at the first court appearance differ drastically in their assessment of the most appropriate placement for these pre-adjudicated youth. While it is certainly not expected that there be a 100% match for any given category, vast differences may indicate some level of disagreement with the PaDRAI's basic construction. Because the analysis is focused on consistency between the PaDRAI recommendation and that which is made at the first court hearing, it should be noted that only those cases where the PaDRAI recommendation and placement were consistent (no "in-out" overrides were included).

Overall, decision-making across the counties was fairly consistent, with over half of cases in each county matching across time periods. However, while matches occurred 74.1% of the time for release cases, they occurred just 52.2% of the time for ATD cases, and 66.5% of the time for detain cases. What is important to note here however, is that the overall number of ATD cases was very low (only 23 cases). As previous tables indicated, ATD recommendations were often overridden. For this reason, it is at this point difficult to draw distinct conclusions regarding the PaDRAI's ATD recommendations, and how consistent such a placement might be with what decision-makers at the first court appearance might determine is the appropriate supervision level. On a positive note, the majority of cases non-match cases where youth were initially detained resulted in placement on an ATD (23.1%). This suggests possible support for the PaDRAI's ATD recommendations. In other words, in a significant proportion of cases resulting in detention at the time of referral, youth were released to an ATD (and a smaller proportion, 8.6%) to a parent or guardian at the first court appearance. This was notably high in Philadelphia county, where only 37.5% of detained youth were continued in detention, while 62.5% were placed on an ATD. In Allegheny, while 76.3% of youth were continued in detention, most of the remaining youth were released to a parent or guardian (18.3%). This pattern was similar also in Lehigh and Lancaster counties.

Table 20. Comparison of PaDRAI placement with outcome of first hearing, by county (N=356\*)

County	Outcome 1st Hrg.	Detention Decision			Total	
		Release	ATD	Detain		
Philadelphia	Detain	N	1	0	24	25
		%	1.8%	0.0%	37.5%	19.1%
	ATD	N	16	9	40	65
		%	29.1%	75.0%	62.5%	49.6%
	Release	N	32	0	0	32
		%	58.2%	0.0%	0.0%	24.4%
	Rearrest/FTA/Viol prior 1st Hrg.	N	3	0	0	3
		%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%
Other	N	3	3	0	6	
	%	5.5%	25.0%	0.0%	4.6%	
Total	N	55	12	64	131	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Allegheny	Detain	N	1	1	71	73
		%	5.3%	50.0%	76.3%	64.0%
	ATD	N	1	0	1	2
		%	5.3%	0.0%	1.1%	1.8%
	Release	N	15	1	17	33
		%	78.9%	50.0%	18.3%	28.9%
	Other	N	1	0	4	5
		%	5.3%	0.0%	4.3%	4.4%
No Hrg.-Case Closed	N	1	0	0	1	
	%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	
Total	N	19	2	93	114	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Lehigh	Detain	N	0	0	18	18
		%	0.0%	0.0%	78.3%	60.0%
	ATD	N	0	0	3	3
		%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	10.0%
	Release	N	1	2	2	5
		%	50.0%	40.0%	8.7%	16.7%
Other	N	1	3	0	4	
	%	50.0%	60.0%	0.0%	13.3%	
Total	N	2	5	23	30	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Lancaster	Detain	N			12	12
		%			70.6%	70.6%
	ATD	N			5	5
		%			29.4%	29.4%
	Total	N			17	17
		%			100.0%	100.0%
Chester	Detain	N	0	0	18	18
		%	0.0%	0.0%	90.0%	72.0%
	ATD	N	0	3	2	5
		%	0.0%	75.0%	10.0%	20.0%
	Release	N	1	0	0	1
		%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
Other	N	0	1	0	1	
	%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	4.0%	
Total	N	1	4	20	25	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Lebanon	Detain	N	1		4	5
		%	2.9%		100.0%	12.8%
	Release	N	34		0	34
		%	97.1%		0.0%	87.2%
	Total	N	35		4	39
		%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%
Total	Detain	N	3	1	147	151
		%	2.7%	4.3%	66.5%	42.4%
	ATD	N	17	12	51	80
		%	15.2%	52.2%	23.1%	22.5%
	Release	N	83	3	19	105
		%	74.1%	13.0%	8.6%	29.5%
	Rearrest/FTA/Viol prior 1st Hrg.	N	3	0	0	3
		%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
	Other	N	5	7	4	16
		%	4.5%	30.4%	1.8%	4.5%
No Hrg.-Case Closed	N	1	0	0	1	
	%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	
Total	N	112	23	221	356	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

\*Total N for this table includes only cases where the PaDRAI recommendation and the actual detention decision match.

## 6. Youth and Public Safety Outcomes

Finally, table 21 below presents findings with respect to youth and public safety outcomes by illustrating the pre-dispositional outcomes for youth either released or placed on an ATD via the PaDRAI. Overwhelmingly, these youth reached disposition successfully without incident (90.6%). Only a total of 4.7% obtained new delinquency allegations (N=12), 0.8% failed to appear for a court hearing (N=2), and 3.1% were remanded to detention for some other violation (N=8). These results tentatively suggest the PaDRAI is appropriately assessing risk for youth referred to detention. However again, the overall number of youth who are recommended for and placed on an ATD is low, thus providing limited data for this group of youth.

Table 21. Pre-Dispositional outcomes for youth released or placed on ATD via PaDRAI (N=254)

Pre-Disp Outcome		Placement via PaDRAI		
		Release	ATD	Total
Youth obtained new charges	N	11	1	12
	%	5.50%	1.90%	4.70%
youth FTA'd	N	1	1	2
	%	0.50%	1.90%	0.80%
Youth Abscond/AWOL	N	0	2	2
	%	0.00%	3.70%	0.80%
Youth returned to detention for other violation	N	2	6	8
	%	1.00%	11.10%	3.10%
Reached disposition without incident	N	186	44	230
	%	93.00%	81.50%	90.60%
Total	N	200	54	254
	%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**A special thanks to all of the members of the PaDRAI Workgroup for all of their hard work on the implementation pilot, and for compiling the data necessary for this report.**

<b>PA Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers PaDRAI Workgroup</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency</b>
David Mueller, Chair	Director	Lancaster County Juvenile Probation
Sally Barry	Director	Lebanon County Probation
Raymond Bauer	Deputy CJPO	Allegheny County Juvenile Probation
Linda Bender	Director of Information & Technology	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Stephen Bishop	Director	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Robert Blakely	CJPO	Erie County Juvenile Probation
Seth Bloomquist	Director of Detention Monitoring	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Fastino Castro-Jimenez	CJPO	Philadelphia County Family Court
Susan Christner	Supervisor-Juvenile Division	Lebanon County Probation
Elizabeth Fritz	CJPO	Lehigh County Juvenile Probation
David Evrard	Deputy CJPO	Allegheny County Juvenile Probation
Laurie Hague	Deputy CJPO	Berks County Juvenile Probation
Rena Kreimer	Juvenile Justice Initiatives Coordinator	Philadelphia County Family Court
Leo Lutz	Director of Training & Graduate Education	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Stephen Lynch	Program Analyst	Pennsylvania Commission Crime & Delinquency
Steven Masciantonio	Intake Supervisor	Philadelphia County Family Court
Katie McGrath	CJPO	Franklin County Juvenile Probation
Cheri Modene	Supervisor	Lancaster County Juvenile Probation
Diana Munson	Deputy CJPO	Chester County Juvenile Probation
Bennie Price	Deputy CJPO	Philadelphia County Family Court
Miriam Prioleau	CPCMS Coordinator	Philadelphia County Family Court
Ryan Schaffer	Supervisor	Lehigh County Juvenile Probation
Shannon Semmel-Ciamacco	Deputy CJPO	Lehigh County Juvenile Probation
Keith Snyder	Executive Director	Juvenile Court Judges' Commission
Richard Steele	Deputy Director	Juvenile Court Judges' Commission
James Stewart	Applications Developer	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Alan Tezak	Consultant	PA Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers
Henry Thielemann	Supervisor	Cumberland County Juvenile Probation
Steve Varner	IT Generalist Administrator	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research

**I would also like to give a big thanks to the following individuals for assisting in compiling and entering the data submitted by each county. This report would not have been possible without their assistance!**

Marlene Benedict  
Data Analyst  
Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research

Seth Bloomquist  
Director of Detention Monitoring  
Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research

James Stuart  
Applications Developer  
Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research

Caleb Sisak  
Graduate Student, Political Science  
Shippensburg University

Sadie Jo Mack  
Undergraduate student, Criminal Justice  
Shippensburg University

**PENNSYLVANIA DETENTION RISK ASSESSMENT  
INSTRUMENT (PaDRAI)  
VALIDATION STUDY FINDINGS**

*Final Report*

*Submitted to the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation  
Officers*

*Detention Subcommittee*

*PaDRAI Work Group*

February 3, 2016

*Report prepared by:*

*Carrie L. Maloney, Ph.D.*

*East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania*

### Executive Summary

- **Sample:** The validation study, covering the period of July 15, 2014 through April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015, resulted in a total of 954 cases where secure detention was not recommended by the PaDRAI, or selected as the final supervision decision.
  - Of these 954 cases, about 14.5% of cases were overridden into a different supervision status than recommended by the PaDRAI (either 'up' to an ATD, or 'down' to straight release).
  - "Trust-the-Tool" month successfully reduced the overall detain override rate from 37.4% (pre-trust-the-tool rate) to just 5.7% (trust-the-tool month cases).
- **Case Outcomes:** In terms of the overall case outcomes, three sets of analyses were performed. The first set included all 954 cases in the validation sample. The second set removed cases for which the final outcome was missing, where the judge remanded the youth at the first court appearance, or where the youth was diverted from the formal juvenile calendar. The third set involved excluding cases where the supervision decision made did not match the PaDRAI recommendation. Outcomes were ultimately very similar across all three sets.
- **Successful Completion rates for the three groups ranged from 91.9% to 92.9%.**
  - 92.9% success rate for full sample, N=954
  - 92.0% success rate for modified outcome sample, N=854
  - 91.9% success rate for supervision-recommendation match only sample, N=731
- In terms of the key measures of '**unsuccessful**' outcomes, numbers are in turn, exceptionally low, ranging from 7.1% to 8.1%.
  - In focusing on the supervision-recommendation match only sample (N=731):
    - only 2.1% (15 youth) obtained new delinquency charges pending court adjudication
    - 3.8% (28 youth) failed to appear for a court hearing
    - Just 0.5% (4 youth) absconded or went AWOL while on pre-adjudatory conditional release.
    - 1.6% (12 youth) were returned to detention for another violation
- In all but one recommendation-release category, successful completion was above 90.0%.
  - The lowest success rate was found for the group of youth who were recommended for straight release, but who were overridden into ATD.
- **Time-to-Failure:** Due to the low base number of youth who absconded/went AWOL (N=2), we cannot reliably interpret the average time to youth failure. In terms of the other three categories, youth who failed to appear for court, as well as those remanded to detention for some other violation had similar times-to-failure, with 20.3 and 22.0 days respectively. On the other hand, youth who obtained new delinquency charges did so, on average, about 8-10 days later than youth who committed other violations (30.4 days).
- **Relationship between individual PaDRAI components and outcome** (not the combined components):
  - Most serious current alleged offense, current status, and history of escape/AWOL/runaway behavior are each statistically significantly associated with outcome (however, the data cannot tell us the direction of this relationship).
  - The remaining PaDRAI items: most serious additional non-related charges, prior adjudications/consent decrees, and FTA history are not statistically significantly associated with outcome.
- **Final Score:** In terms of the overall score generated by the PaDRAI, there is a statistically significant relationship with outcome. Specifically, with every one-point increase in the youths' score on the PaDRAI, the odds of 'failure' do increase slightly.

## Introduction

According to Steinhart (2006, 18), “validation refers to the process of confirming the predictive value of the RAI [Risk Assessment Instrument] in relation to specific outcome measures.” In other words, validation efforts seek to determine the extent to which the RAI accurately determines which youth may be successfully monitored in the community by a parent/guardian, or by an ATD (alternative to detention), pending the resolution of their case. In order to determine success or failure, two primary outcomes are measured: occurrence of a new offense, or a failure to appear in court, pending final disposition. In addition, youth who commit some other form of violation deemed serious enough to result in placement into detention pending disposition (e.g., purposefully removing an electronic monitoring bracelet) will also be considered in assessing overall outcomes. As such, proper validation requires that data be collected on cases where the RAI recommends non-detention, and that non-detention was in-fact the placement decision at the time of the RAI’s completion. Ideally, validation samples reflect placement decisions that are a ‘match’ with the specific RAI recommendation. For example, if the RAI recommends release, the youth is released (rather than placed onto an ATD), and vice-versa. However, all non-detained RAI recommendations resulting in any non-detention placement were collected and considered for this report, however outcomes for recommendation-decision match and non-match cases will be clearly shown separately.

Data collection for the validation study was prospective in nature, in that it was collected in real-time, as the 7 pilot sites implemented the draft Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (PaDRAI)<sup>2</sup> on a trial basis. The validation pilot commenced in all 7 sites on July 15, 2014. Initial estimates predicted that a sufficient number of cases would be processed and collected within about a three-month time period. This was not the case however, and data collection continued. A draft interim report was completed in February of 2015 in order to provide a ‘first look’ at the progress of the pilot and validation data effort.

As a result of the interim report review, the workgroup make two key decisions. The first was to establish a final cut-off date of April 30, 2015 for the validation pilot. The second was to promote what would be called a ‘trust-the-tool’ month for the month of April. The interim report highlighted a PaDRAI override rate that was determined by the group to be unacceptably high. In addition, the report did in-fact show evidence that the most successful youth with respect to the outcome measures were those for which the PaDRAI recommendation was followed. Workgroup members were encouraged to take this preliminary finding back to their respective counties and urge decision-makers to make all efforts to ‘trust-the-tool’ and follow through with the PaDRAI recommendations.

At the conclusion of the validation collection period, time was allotted for the collection of the needed follow-up outcome data. Cases were tracked through to disposition, or to 60 days from the time of the initial decision. After the 60-day follow-up period concluded, data were sent in for processing and analysis. In total, 954 cases were collected. While all 954 cases were included in some analyses, some portion of cases had to be excluded from others. Where this is the case, notes are provided explaining in detail, the number of and reason for any case exclusion. The following report represents the findings of this effort.

---

<sup>2</sup> Although commonly referred to as an ‘assessment instrument’, the PaDRAI’s design is currently more consistent with that of a screening/classification instrument (see Hoge, 2002; OJJDP, 1995; Weibush et al., 1995).

## Part I. Demographic Characteristics of Validation Sample

The first set of tables provides an overview of the basic demographic characteristics of the validation sample. These include the overall contribution of cases per county, the gender, racial and ethnic breakdown of the overall sample, as well as the gender, racial and ethnic breakdown of the sample by county.

Table 1. Number of Cases, per County (N=954)

	N	%
Philadelphia	284	29.8
Allegheny	221	23.2
Lancaster	194	20.3
Lehigh	113	11.8
Lebanon	80	8.4
Franklin	44	4.6
Chester	18	1.9
Total	954	100.0

Table 1 shows the number of cases included in the validation study per county. As expected, Philadelphia had the highest proportion of cases (29.8%), followed by Allegheny (23.2%), and then Lancaster (20.3). On the low end, Chester County had the smallest overall number of cases, with just 1.9% of the sample.

Table 2. Gender of Validation Sample (N=954)

	N	%
male	752	78.8
female	202	21.2
Total	954	100.0

In terms of gender, table 2 shows the validation sample to include 78.8% male cases, and 21.2% female cases.

Table 3. Race Distribution of Validation Sample  
(N=934, 97.9%)

	N	%
Black	444	46.5
Caucasian	452	47.4
Asian	2	0.2
other	36	3.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>934</b>	<b>97.9</b>
<i>Missing</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>2.1</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>954</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 3 provides the racial distribution of the validation sample. The number of cases included here is 934, as 20 cases had missing racial data. This represents just 2.1% of the overall sample however. As shown, both Black and Caucasian youth were nearly equally represented in the sample, comprising 46.5% and 47.4% respectively.

Table 4. Youth's Ethnicity (N=556, 58.3%)

	N	%
non-Hispanic	408	42.8
Hispanic	148	15.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>58.3</b>
<i>Missing</i>	<i>398</i>	<i>41.7</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>954</i>	<i>100</i>

In terms of ethnicity, we can see in Table 4 that there were in-fact many missing cases – about 42%. This only allows us to determine with confidence that 42.8% of the sample were non-Hispanic, while 15.5% were Hispanic.

Next, tables 5-7 show the breakdown of gender, race, and ethnicity by county.

Table 5. Youth's Gender, by County (N=954)

County	Gender			Total
		male	female	
Philadelphia	N	223	61	284
	%	78.50%	21.50%	100.00%
Allegheny	N	174	47	221
	%	78.70%	21.30%	100.00%
Lehigh	N	92	21	113
	%	81.40%	18.60%	100.00%
Lancaster	N	162	32	194
	%	83.50%	16.50%	100.00%
Chester	N	13	5	18
	%	72.20%	27.80%	100.00%
Franklin	N	30	14	44
	%	68.20%	31.80%	100.00%
Lebanon	N	58	22	80
	%	72.50%	27.50%	100.00%
Total	N	752	202	954
	%	78.80%	21.20%	100.00%

Despite some variation across Counties in terms of the overall representation of males versus females in the validation sample, this variation is not statistically significant. This means that in terms of gender, the representation of males versus females is statistically equivalent for each county (i.e., no county has significantly more males versus females etc. than any other county). Moreover, the representation by county is comparable to the overall sample.

Table 6. Youth's Race, by County (N=934, 97.9%)

County	Race				Total	
		Black	Caucasian	Asian		Other/UK
Philadelphia	N	184	70	0	21	275
	%	66.90%	25.50%	0.00%	7.60%	100.00%
Allegheny	N	171	41	0	2	214
	%	79.90%	19.20%	0.00%	0.90%	100.00%
Lehigh	N	36	74	0	2	112
	%	32.10%	66.10%	0.00%	1.80%	100.00%
Lancaster	N	38	143	2	8	191
	%	19.90%	74.90%	1.00%	4.20%	100.00%
Chester	N	4	13	0	1	18
	%	22.20%	72.20%	0.00%	5.60%	100.00%

Franklin	N	8	34	0	2	44
	%	18.20%	77.30%	0.00%	4.50%	100.00%
Lebanon	N	3	77	0	0	80
	%	3.80%	96.30%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	N	444	452	2	36	934
	%	47.50%	48.40%	0.20%	3.90%	100.00%

Here, we see the racial breakdown of youth in the total validation sample by county. For 20 of the final validation cases, race was not identified for the youth. For this reason, the overall percentages represented here are out of an N of 934 (with 934 representing 97.9% of the original sample).

With respect to race, while Blacks represent about 47.5%, and Whites 48.4% of the total sample, there is statistically significant variation across counties in terms of the racial contribution to the final validation sample. For example, Lebanon had the lowest representation of Black youth (3.8%), and Allegheny the highest (79.9%).

Table 7. Youth's Ethnicity, by County (N=556, 58.3%)

County	Ethnicity			Total
	non-Hisp.	Hisp.		
Philadelphia	N	26	7	33
	%	78.80%	21.20%	100.00%
Allegheny	N	156	2	158
	%	98.70%	1.30%	100.00%
Lehigh	N	58	54	112
	%	51.80%	48.20%	100.00%
Lancaster	N	111	56	167
	%	66.50%	33.50%	100.00%
Chester	N	2	0	2
	%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Franklin	N	12	0	12
	%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Lebanon	N	43	29	72
	%	59.70%	40.30%	100.00%
Total	N	408	148	556
	%	73.40%	26.60%	100.00%

Ethnicity (Hispanic/Non-Hispanic) was identified for just over half of the validation sample (58.3%), with that data missing for the remaining cases. The table here indicates the overall proportion of Hispanic/non-Hispanic youth in each county, and overall, relative to the total number where ethnicity was available (N=556).

Similar to the distribution seen with youth's race across counties, there is statistically significant variation with respect to ethnicity.

## Part II. Characteristics of PaDRAI Recommendations & Supervision Decisions

Table 8. PaDRAI Recommendation, by Actual Decision (N=954)

Decision	PaDRAI Recommendation			Total
		Release	ATD	
Release	N	583	69	652
	%	89.40%	22.80%	68.30%
ATD	N	69	233	302
	%	10.60%	77.20%	31.70%
Total	N	652	302	954
	%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Table 8 indicates the pre-adjudication supervision decision for youth, relative to the recommendation made by the PaDRAI. For youth recommended for release, 89.4% were in fact released. For youth recommended for an ATD, 77.2% were placed on an ATD. Overall, among the validation sample of youth, about 14.5% of cases were overridden into a different supervision status than recommended by the PaDRAI.

*Note* – this does not include youth who may have been overridden into, or out of detention as these cases do not meet the criteria for validation analysis. However, as a point of interest, override rates are shown below.

- Combined *detain* override rate, pre-trust-the-tool and trust-the-tool cases: **27.3%**
- Total *detain* override rate, pre- trust-the-tool data: **37.4%**
- Total *detain* override rate, trust-the-tool data: **9.8%**
  - *Detain* override rate, removing mandatory cases: **5.7%**

These figures represent the variation in override rates during the validation study period. The total overall *detain* override rate (cases recommended for release or an ATD, but who were detained) for the entire validation period was 27.3%. However, in recalling the initial *detain* override rate of 37.4% as reported in the interim report prompted the April 2015 'trust-the-tool' month push for reducing overrides, it was worth noting the rate change for that time period. As indicated, the overall *detain* override rate was reduced down to 9.8%. Moreover, when the mandatory override cases are removed, leaving only those cases for which the override was discretionary, the rate drops even further, down to just 5.7%.

According to Steinhart (2006), override rates are generally recommended to not exceed between 15-20% of cases. This recommendation reflects those made by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (no more than 15%), and the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (no more than 15-20%). Moreover, any override rates exceeding 25% should be viewed as a 'red flag', prompting detailed review of override procedures.

While the overall rate of overrides during the validation period does exceed the 25% point of concern, there was a stark decline in overrides during the trust-the-tool month. In fact, the rate fell quite far below even the lower threshold of 15-20%.

### Part III. Case Outcome Analysis

Tables 9-12 provide various breakdowns of the final case outcomes for youth. First, table 9 provides the most comprehensive view of the various case outcomes, to include those other than our key variables of interest (new delinquency charge, FTA, AWOL/Abscond, and other violation). These outcomes are also presented in terms of the PaDRAI recommendation-decision match categories. Table 10 then collapses the outcome data to include *only* our key variables of interest. As we move from table 11 to table 12, you will see the total N for the tables does change as we collapse and remove some cases that are not seen to fall within our outcome categories of concern. Overall, this did have very little effect on the overall outcome rates as presented.

Table 9. Recommendation-Decision Match Type, by Case Outcome (N=954)

Outcome		Match Type				Total
		RIs Match	ATD match	RIs-ATD Non Match	ATD-rIs non match	
Youth obtained new charges	N	12	3	0	0	15
	%	2.10%	1.30%	0.00%	0.00%	1.60%
youth FTA'd	N	19	9	1	1	30
	%	3.30%	3.90%	1.40%	1.40%	3.10%
Youth Abscond/AWOL	N	4	0	1	0	5
	%	0.70%	0.00%	1.40%	0.00%	0.50%
Youth returned to detention for other violation	N	4	8	5	1	18
	%	0.70%	3.40%	7.20%	1.40%	1.90%
Reached disposition without incident	N	438	188	52	58	736
	%	75.10%	80.70%	75.40%	84.10%	77.10%
charges dismissed/not filed	N	42	4	2	2	50
	%	7.20%	1.70%	2.90%	2.90%	5.20%

detained by judge at first court hearing	N	3	5	3	0	11
	%	0.50%	2.10%	4.30%	0.00%	1.20%
YAP-case closed	N	48	9	0	0	57
	%	8.20%	3.90%	0.00%	0.00%	6.00%
Final outcome missing	N	13	7	5	7	32
	%	2.20%	3.00%	7.20%	10.10%	3.40%
Total	N	583	233	69	69	954
	%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Here in table 9, we see the final outcome for youth in the validation sample, by PaDRAI recommendation-decision match type.

In looking at overall rates by outcome, we can see that in terms of the key measures of '*unsuccessful*' outcomes, numbers are exceptionally low. Only 1.6% (15 youth) obtained new delinquency charges pending court adjudication, while 3.1% (30 youth) failed to appear for a court hearing, and just 0.5% (5 youth) absconded or went AWOL while on pre-adjudicatory conditional release. For initial tracking purposes, four additional codes were used to capture youth outcomes (other than those who reached disposition successfully without qualification). These include: Charges dismissed or not filed/case closed; youth detained by judge at first court hearing; YAP diversion-case closed; and final outcome missing/unclear.

When we collapse the outcome categories, as in table 10 below, we have a more accurate representation of the key outcomes/behaviors of interest:

- Cases diverted to YAP, where the youth was detained by the judge at his/her first court appearance, and for whom final outcome data was missing were excluded from this outcome analysis. Cases for which charges were ultimately dropped or were not filed within the 60-day follow-up period were coded as having reached disposition without incident, as these youth did remain on release or an ATD for the follow-up period. The result was a total of 854 valid cases.
- **Successful Completion rate was 92.0% (786 youth).**
- Unsuccessful Completion rate was 8.0% (68 youth).
  - 1.8% obtained new delinquency charges
  - 3.5% failed to appear for court
  - 0.6% absconded/AWOL'd from supervision
  - 2.1% were returned to detention for violation of their release
- In all but one recommendation-release category, successful completion was above 90.0%.
  - The lowest success rate was found for the group of youth who were recommended for straight release, but who were overridden into ATD.

Table 10. Recommendation-Decision Match Type, by Collapsed Outcome (N=854)

Outcome	Type of Match				Total
	RIs Match	ATD match	rls-ATD non match	ATD-rls non match	
Youth obtained new charges	N	12	3	0	15
	%	2.30%	1.40%	0.00%	1.80%
youth FTA'd	N	19	9	1	30
	%	3.70%	4.20%	1.60%	3.50%
Youth Abscond/AWOL	N	4	0	1	5
	%	0.80%	0.00%	1.60%	0.60%
Youth returned to detention for other violation	N	4	8	5	18
	%	0.80%	3.80%	8.20%	2.10%
Reached disposition without incident	N	480	192	54	786
	%	92.50%	90.60%	88.50%	96.80%
Total	N	519	212	61	854
	%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

However, as per Steinhart (2006), key to fully validating the PaDRAI requires further breakdown of outcomes while focusing *only* on recommendation-supervision decision match cases, as is presented in table 11 below.

Table 11. Recommendation-Decision Match Type by Outcome, Matches Only (N=731)

Outcome	Match Type			Total
	RIs Match	ATD match		
Youth obtained new charges	N	12	3	15
	%	2.30%	1.40%	2.10%
youth FTA'd	N	19	9	28
	%	3.70%	4.20%	3.80%
Youth Abscond/AWOL	N	4	0	4
	%	0.80%	0.00%	0.50%
Youth returned to detention for other violation	N	4	8	12
	%	0.80%	3.80%	1.60%
Reached disposition without incident	N	480	192	672
	%	92.50%	90.60%	91.90%
Total	N	519	212	731
	%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Here in table 11, we focus only on those cases where the decision matched the recommendation of the PaDRAI. Not surprisingly, the overall proportion of successful youth is nearly identical to that seen in the prior chart. **91.9% (672 youth)** successfully reached disposition without incident, producing an unsuccessful completion rate of just 8.1%. These results are consistent with the validation standards as discussed by Steinhart (2006). In summarizing the existing validation efforts in both adult and juvenile justice systems, it is suggested that an RAI that yields a failure rate of less than 10% of the non-detained group, should be given a ‘passing grade’. Furthermore, he states that re-offense and FTA rates that come in under 5% can be considered good performance. It should be noted however that all RAI users continually monitor these rates because while low failure rates certainly are positive, very low rates may be indicative of an overly-restrictive instrument.

Table. 12 Successful/Unsuccessful Outcome, by County (N=731)

County		Outcome		Total
		unsuccessful	successful	
Philadelphia	N	29	179	208
	%	13.90%	86.10%	100.00%
Allegheny	N	13	161	174
	%	7.50%	92.50%	100.00%
Lehigh	N	5	72	77
	%	6.50%	93.50%	100.00%
Lancaster	N	11	149	160
	%	6.90%	93.10%	100.00%
Chester	N	0	6	6
	%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Franklin	N	0	41	41
	%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Lebanon	N	1	64	65
	%	1.50%	98.50%	100.00%
Total	N	59	672	731
	%	8.10%	91.90%	100.00%

In order to provide a view of outcome by county, outcomes were collapsed into a dichotomous ‘successful/unsuccessful’ measure. While detailed outcome data is available for each county, the base numbers of unsuccessful cases is so low that most percentages/proportions per county do not allow for meaningful statistical analysis. Here of course we can see a range of outcomes, with both Franklin and Lebanon experiencing 100% successful completion rates. Four of the remaining counties experienced success rates above 90%, and Philadelphia’s success rate was 86.1%.

## Part IV. Characteristics of Unsuccessful Cases

In addition to examining the overall proportion of youth who are not successful while on conditional release/ATD pending court adjudication, it can also be useful to take a closer look at the average time to failure.

Table 13. Time to Failure, in days, overall sample (N=49, 83.1%)

Match Type	Mean	Median	N
Release Match	22.7	19.0	33
ATD match	25.4	16.0	16
Total	23.6	17.0	49

Table 13 above indicates that for both match groups, time-to-failure is similar, with a mean of 22.7 days for release match youth, and 25.4 days for ATD match youth. In terms of statistical significance, there is no significant difference in the time-to-failure between these groups. Note that for 10 of the match cases, reliable dates were not available to measure time-to-failure.

Table 14. Time to Failure, in days, by fail type (N=49, 83.1%)

Fail Type	Mean	N
New Charges	30.4	12
FTA	20.3	26
Abscond/AWOL	32.0	2
Other Viol	22.0	9
Total	23.6	49

Here we examine the time-to-failure based upon the type of youth violation. Due to the low base number of youth who absconded/went AWOL (N=2), we cannot reliably interpret the mean. In terms of the other three categories, youth who failed to appear for court, as well as those remanded to detention for some other violation had similar times-to-failure, with 20.3 and 22.0 days respectively. On the other hand, youth who obtained new delinquency charges did so, on average, about 8-10 days later than youth who committed other violations (30.4 days). This is a statistically significant difference, warranting a closer look at just these youth.

Of the 12 youth who obtained new charges, and for whom data on time-to-failure was available, 10 were release match cases, and 2 were ATD match cases.

- The 12 release-match cases averaged 27 days-to-failure, while the 2 ATD match cases averaged 47 days (however again, an N=2 does not allow for a meaningful average).

Table 15. Overview of New Delinquency Charges

Charge	N
Aggravated Assault*	3
Robbery F1	2
Drug Related	2
Theft/Receiving Stolen Property	3
Simple Assault	1
Adult charge, unspecified	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>

\*Of these 3 cases, one youth was charged with: F1 Agg. Assault; M1 Possess. Weapon W CI; M2 Simple Assault; M2 Reckless Endangerment. All others were single charge-offenses.

### *PaDRAI Characteristics of Unsuccessful Youth*

While the current number of unsuccessful youth (N=59) whose pre-adjudication supervision matched the recommendation of the PaDRAI is somewhat low, there are some identifiable characteristics. Tables 16-18 compare successful and unsuccessful youth on each of the PaDRAI variables, each chart highlighting two variables. What we see overall, is that the components capturing most serious current alleged offense, current status, and history of escape/AWOL/runaway behavior are each statistically significantly related to youth final outcomes; while the remaining components: most serious additional non-related charges, prior adjudications/consent decrees, and FTA history are not statistically significantly associated with youth outcomes. However, this only tells us that on their own (not in conjunction with the other items on the tool), there is a significant relationship. In addition, the data as it stands cannot indicate the direction of the relationship – in other words, we cannot say for instance, as the seriousness of the current alleged offense increases, the youths' likelihood of failure increases. This level of analysis will be possible however, as the PaDRAI implementation moves forward, and additional data are recorded and monitored with respect to youth outcomes.

The following three tables, 16-18 show these results, two components at a time.

Table 16. Comparing Successful vs. Unsuccessful Youth on PaDRAI Variables (N=695): Most Serious New Alleged Offense & Additional Non-Related Charge(s)

		Outcome		
		unsuccessful	successful	Total
<b>1. MSNAO (p=.073)</b>				
felony II or Felony Drug Ungraded	N	8	115	123
	%	6.50%	93.50%	100.00%
felony III	N	11	58	69
	%	15.90%	84.10%	100.00%
Misdemeanor I	N	7	157	164
	%	4.30%	95.70%	100.00%
Misdemeanor II or Misdemeanor Drug Ungraded	N	22	234	256
	%	8.60%	91.40%	100.00%
Misdemeanor III or Ungraded	N	5	62	67
	%	7.50%	92.50%	100.00%
NO new charge	N	2	14	16
	%	12.50%	87.50%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	N	55	640	695
	%	7.90%	92.10%	100.00%
<b>2. MSANRC (p=.319)</b>				
Felony I	N	1	2	3
	%	33.30%	66.70%	100.00%
Felony II or Felony Drug Ungraded	N	2	10	12
	%	16.70%	83.30%	100.00%
Felony III	N	0	4	4
	%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Misdemeanor I	N	2	18	20
	%	10.00%	90.00%	100.00%
Misdemeanor II or Misdemeanor Drug Ungraded	N	3	18	21
	%	14.30%	85.70%	100.00%
Misdemeanor III or Ungraded	N	0	16	16
	%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
NO additional non-related charges	N	47	572	619
	%	7.60%	92.40%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	N	55	640	695
	%	7.90%	92.10%	100.00%

With respect to the first two PaDRAI variables, Table 16 provides each of the individual attributes for items 1 and 2 on the PaDRAI: Most serious current alleged offense and Most serious additional non-related charges. For each attribute we can see, of the youth scoring with that attribute, the proportion who were ultimately successful vs. unsuccessful. For example, of the 69 youth called in for a felony III charge as the most serious new alleged offense, 84.1% were successful, while 15.9% were unsuccessful.

For both PaDRAI categories, a set of parentheses (), with a p value are provided. A p-value is an indicator of statistical significance. There are three general levels of statistical significance indicated by the p-value:

- $P < .05$ ;  $p < .01$ ;  $p < .001$
- Where p-values are less than each of these thresholds, the relationship is statistically significant, with those  $p < .001$  having the strongest statistical relationship.

As can be seen, most serious current alleged offense is statistically significantly related to whether a youth is successful/unsuccessful. However, this does not tell us the nature of the relationship (i.e., it is not suggesting that the more serious the alleged offense, the more likely one is to be unsuccessful).

Conversely, most serious additional non-related charge is not statistically significantly associated with successful vs. unsuccessful outcomes.

Table 17. Comparing Successful vs. Unsuccessful Youth on PaDRAI Variables (N=695): Current Status & Prior Adjudications/Consent Decrees

		Outcome		
		unsuccessful	successful	Total
<b>3. Current Status (p=.004)</b>				
Placement	N	0	1	1
	%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Aftercare Supervision (w/in 2 months)	N	1	6	7
	%	14.30%	85.70%	100.00%
Formal Probation	N	13	57	70
	%	18.60%	81.40%	100.00%
Pre-adjudication alternative to detention	N	2	5	7
	%	28.60%	71.40%	100.00%
Consent Decree	N	0	24	24
	%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Informal Adjustment	N	1	14	15
	%	6.70%	93.30%	100.00%
None of the above	N	38	533	571
	%	6.70%	93.30%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	N	55	640	695
	%	7.90%	92.10%	100.00%
<b>4. Prior Adjudications or Consent Decrees (p=.480)</b>				
Multiple prior findings for Felony Offenses (all gradings)	N	0	1	1
	%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
one prior finding for a felony offense (all gradings)	N	4	25	29
	%	13.80%	86.20%	100.00%
multiple findings for Misdemeanor Offenses (all gradings)	N	3	30	33
	%	9.10%	90.90%	100.00%
One prior finding for a misdemeanor offense (all gradings)	N	3	11	14
	%	21.40%	78.60%	100.00%
one or more prior misd OR consent-non specified	N	3	34	37
	%	8.10%	91.90%	100.00%

one or more prior consent decrees	N	1	18	19
	%	5.30%	94.70%	100.00%
NO prior findings	N	41	521	562
	%	7.30%	92.70%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	N	55	640	695
	%	7.90%	92.10%	100.00%

As seen in Table 17, while current status is statistically significantly associated with final outcome, prior adjudications/consent decrees is not.

Table 18. Comparing Successful vs. Unsuccessful Youth on PaDRAI Variables (N=695): FTA Warrant History & History of Escape/AWOL/Runaway

		Outcome		
		unsuccessful	successful	Total
<b>5. FTA Warrant History (p=.485)</b>				
one warrant for FTA in past 12 months	N	1	7	8
	%	12.50%	87.50%	100.00%
NO warrants for FTA in past 12 months	N	54	633	687
	%	7.90%	92.10%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	N	55	640	695
	%	7.90%	92.10%	100.00%
<b>6. HISTORY OF ESCAPE/AWOL/RUNAWAY (p=.000)</b>				
one or more escapes from secure confinement or custody	N	1	0	1
	%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
one or more instances of AWOL from non-secure ct ordered placement	N	2	3	5
	%	40.00%	60.00%	100.00%
two or more runaways from home or voluntary placement	N	4	12	16
	%	25.00%	75.00%	100.00%
NO history of escape/AWOL past 12 months	N	48	625	673
	%	7.10%	92.90%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	N	55	640	695
	%	7.90%	92.10%	100.00%

In terms of the last two items on the PaDRAI, table 18 indicates that while FTA history is not statistically significantly associated with outcome, history of escape/AWOL/runaway behavior is significant.

The next analysis, presented in table 19 takes a slightly different view in examining unsuccessful youth. Here, we look at both demographic characteristics and the PaDRAI attributes to see which specific attributes are most common among unsuccessful youth.

Table 19. Characteristics of Unsuccessful Youth (N=59)

Variable	N	%
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	4	
	9	83.1
Female	1	
	0	16.9
Total	5	
	9	100
<b>Race</b>		
African American	3	
	7	62.7
Caucasian	1	
other	9	32.2
	2	3.4
Total	5	
<i>missing</i>	8	98.3
	1	1.7
Total	5	
	9	100
<b>1. Most Serious New Alleged Offense</b>		
felony II or Felony Drug Ungraded	8	13.6
	1	
felony III	1	18.6
Misdemeanor I	7	11.9
	2	
Misdemeanor II or Misdemeanor Drug Ungraded	2	37.3
Misdemeanor III or Ungraded	5	8.5
No new charge	2	3.4
Total	5	
<i>missing</i>	5	93.2
	4	6.8
Total	5	
	9	100
<b>2. Most Serious Additional/Pending Charge(s)</b>		
Felony I	1	1.7
Felony II or Felony Drug Ungraded	2	3.4
Misdemeanor I	2	3.4
Misdemeanor II or Misdemeanor Drug Ungraded	3	5.1
	4	
No additional non-related charges	7	79.7
Total	5	
<i>missing</i>	5	93.2
	4	6.8
Total	5	
	9	100
<b>3. Current Status</b>		
Aftercare Supervision (w/in 2 months)	1	1.7
	1	
Formal Probation	3	22
Pre-adjudication alternative to detention	2	3.4
Informal Adjustment	1	1.7
	3	
None of the above	8	64.4
Total	5	
<i>missing</i>	5	93.2
	4	6.8
Total	5	
	9	100
<b>4. Prior Adjudications/Consent Decreases</b>		
One prior finding for a felony offense (all gradings)	4	6.8
Multiple findings for Misdemeanor Offenses (all gradings)	3	5.1
One prior finding for a misdemeanor offense (all gradings)	3	5.1
One or more prior misd OR consent-non specified	3	5.1
One or more prior consent decrees	1	1.7

No prior findings	4	
	1	69.5
	5	
Total	5	93.2
<i>missing</i>	4	6.8
	5	
Total	9	100
<b>5. History of Warrants for FTA</b>		
One warrant for FTA in past 12 months	1	1.7
	5	
No warrants for FTA in past 12 months	4	91.5
	5	
Total	5	93.2
<i>missing</i>	4	6.8
	5	
Total	9	100
<b>6. History of Escape/AWOL/Runaway</b>		
One or more escapes from secure confinement or custody	1	1.7
One or more instances of AWOL from non-secure ct ordered placement	2	3.4
Two or more runaways from home or voluntary placement	4	6.8
	4	
No history of escape/AWOL past 12 months	8	81.4
	5	
Total	5	93.2
<i>missing</i>	4	6.8
	5	
Total	9	100

As shown, what can be said to be a most 'typical' unsuccessful youth are those who are: African American males called in for a misdemeanor II or misdemeanor drug ungraded offense, with no additional unrelated charges, either on so supervision or who are on formal probation, with no prior findings, FTA's or history of escape/AWOL/runaway behavior. Note again here, these 'typical' or most-often occurring characteristics are not all statistically significant, but merely represent what most often occurred for this specific sample. Further data collection as the PaDRAI implementation moves forward will be able to provide more precise results.

## Part V. PaDRAI's Effectiveness in Classification of Youth

In terms of the PaDRAI's categorical classification of youth into either the low-risk (release) or moderate risk (ATD) groups, there is no current statistically significant relationship with whether or not the youth is ultimately successful. In other words, as currently designed in terms of the range of scores determining these two categories, there is no discernible difference, statistically, between the two groups.

In terms of the overall score generated by the PaDRAI, there is a statistically significant relationship with outcome ( $p=.021$ ). Specifically, with every one-point increase in the youths' score on the PaDRAI, the odds of 'failure' do increase slightly.

## Part VI. Conclusions & Recommendations

Overall, the results of this validation study have proven very successful. In terms of the primary areas of concern, the study found that the PaDRAI is effective in its ability to appropriately categorize youth in terms of their appropriateness for community based supervision, versus secure detention. Successful rates for youth supervised at home or in conjunction with an ATD were above the 90% threshold, however not so high to produce any red-flags regarding over-restrictiveness or ‘net-widening’. Moreover, of youth who were unsuccessful, only a small proportion obtained new delinquency charges, most of which were non-violent misdemeanors. Based upon these findings, the workgroup was in agreement that the PaDRAI move from the pilot/testing phase, to statewide implementation, in conjunction with the training protocol under development. It is further recommended that data continue to be collected and monitored for all sites utilizing the PaDRAI, paying particular attention to capturing precise data regarding youth outcomes. In doing so, several of the analyses presented in limited form here, may be further refined, providing a wealth of very precise data regarding each component of the instrument, as well as how each of the risk factors work together. The workgroup would like to further suggest that once the statewide implementation begins, and is underway for a minimum of one year, a new report is generated to ensure ongoing validation of the instrument. As a final note, the success of the PaDRAI in producing high success rates, particularly as sites were able to reduce overrides to below 6% of all cases should be commended, and viewed as strong support for the PaDRAI’s design, and its ability to safely screen youth away from secure detention.

### References

- Hoge, R.D. (2002). Standardized Instruments for Assessing Risk and Need in Youthful Offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 380-396.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (1995). *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Steinhart, D. (2006). *Juvenile Detention Risk Assessment: A Practice Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Weibush, R.G., Baird, C., Krisberg, B. & Onek, D. (1995). Risk Assessment and Classification for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders. In Howell, J.C., B. Krisberg, J.D. Hawkins, & J.J.Wilson (Eds.) *Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders: A Sourcebook* (171-202). CA: Sage.

<b>PA Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers Detention Subcommittee PaDRAI Workgroup</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Agency</b>
David Mueller - Chair	Lancaster County Juvenile Probation
Sally Barry	Lebanon County Juvenile Probation
Raymond Bauer	Allegheny County Juvenile Probation
Linda Bender	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Robert Blakely	Erie County Juvenile Probation
Seth Bloomquist	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Stephen Bishop	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Susan Christner	Lebanon County Juvenile Probation
David Evrard	Allegheny County Juvenile Probation
Elizabeth Fritz	Lehigh County Juvenile Probation
Laurie Hague	Berks County Juvenile Probation
Rena Kreimer	Philadelphia County Juvenile Probation
Leo Lutz	Juvenile Court Judges' Commission
Carrie Maloney	East Stroudsburg University
Steve Masciantonio	Philadelphia County Juvenile Probation
Kathleen McGrath	Franklin County Juvenile Probation
Cheri Modene	Lancaster County Juvenile Probation
Barbara Mull	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Diana Munson	Chester County Juvenile Probation
Bennie Price	Philadelphia County Juvenile Probation
Miriam Prioleau	Philadelphia County Juvenile Probation
Ryan Schaffer	Lehigh County Juvenile Probation
Shannon Semmel	Lehigh County Juvenile Probation
Dana Shoenberg	Center for Children's Law & Policy
Keith Snyder	Juvenile Court Judges' Commission
Richard Steele	Juvenile Court Judges' Commission
James Stewart	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Mark Soler	Center for Children's Law & Policy
Marcy Szumanski	PA Commission on Crime & Delinquency
Alan Tezak	PA Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers
Hank Thielemann	Cumberland County Juvenile Probation
Steve Varner	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Timothy Wright	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research

**The workgroup would like to thank everyone who assisted in piloting the PaDRAI, diligently collecting the data needed to complete this study. In addition, we would like to thank the following individuals for assisting in compiling and entering the data submitted by each county. This report would not have been possible without their assistance!**

Marlene Benedict  
Data Analyst  
Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research

Seth Bloomquist  
Director of Detention Monitoring  
Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research

<b>PA Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers Detention Ad Hoc Committee PaDRAI Workgroup</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Agency</b>
David Mueller - Chair	Lancaster County Juvenile Probation
Sally Barry	Lebanon County Juvenile Probation
Raymond Bauer	Allegheny County Juvenile Probation
Linda Bender	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Robert Blakely	Erie County Juvenile Probation
Seth Bloomquist	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Stephen Bishop	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Susan Christner	Lebanon County Juvenile Probation
David Evrard	Allegheny County Juvenile Probation
Elizabeth Fritz	Lehigh County Juvenile Probation
Laurie Hague	Berks County Juvenile Probation
Rena Kreimer	Philadelphia County Juvenile Probation
Leo Lutz	Juvenile Court Judges' Commission
Carrie Maloney	East Stroudsburg University
Steve Masciantonio	Philadelphia County Juvenile Probation
Kathleen McGrath	Franklin County Juvenile Probation
Cheri Modene	Lancaster County Juvenile Probation
Barbara Mull	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Diana Munson	Chester County Juvenile Probation
Bennie Price	Philadelphia County Juvenile Probation
Miriam Prioleau	Philadelphia County Juvenile Probation
Ryan Schaffer	Lehigh County Juvenile Probation
Shannon Semmel	Lehigh County Juvenile Probation
Dana Shoenberg	Center for Children's Law & Policy
Keith Snyder	Juvenile Court Judges' Commission
Richard Steele	Juvenile Court Judges' Commission
James Stewart	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Mark Soler	Center for Children's Law & Policy
Marcy Szumanski	PA Commission on Crime & Delinquency
Alan Tezak	PA Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers
Hank Thielemann	Cumberland County Juvenile Probation
Steve Varner	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research
Timothy Wright	Center for Juvenile Justice Training & Research